THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 5. AUGUST, 1927. Vol. XVII.

IN MEMORIAM

SIR WILLIAM ASHLEY.

BY the death, on the 23rd of July, of Sir William Ashley, Ph.D., Honorary Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford, nd sometime Vice-Principal of Birmingham University, the lodernist cause suffers a grievous loss. Although the great work f Sir William's life was the study and teaching of economic istory—he filled in turn the professorial chairs in Economics t the Universities of Toronto, Harvard, and Birmingham—in hich he secured a world-wide reputation as an authority in his ubject—his first book, *An Introduction to English Economic listory and Theory*, being translated into German, French, and apanese—yet he found time to take a serious interest in reli- on. When many years ago a public meeting for the exposition f the aims of the Churchmen's Union was held at Birmingham, e said at its conclusion, 'I am going to join you as you have me out into the open.' He became in due course a member of e Council and a Vice-President, and attended the Modern hurchmen's Conferences regularly. He contributed a number articles to *The Modern Churchman*, the last being in August, 926, on Conversion—an article of singular and impressive in- rest. It concluded thus :

'But the question was already beginning to be perplexing—how creed and emotion were related to life; and the writer (of the First Epistle of St. John) feels compelled to fall back on unmistakable fundamentals—on that evidence about which there can be no mistake :

"Little children, let no man deceive you: he that doeth righteousness is righteous."'

In these words Sir William Ashley expressed his own conviction that the Christian Religion is predominantly an ethical religion and that Christian conduct and Christian character are both its fruits and its tests. It was this conviction, combined with his belief in the modern critical method in the study of the Bible and Church History, and his general acceptance of their results which made him a Modernist. Besides his helpful support of the Churchmen's Union and his faithful discharge of his duties as Churchwarden of Birmingham Cathedral, his interest in religion was shewn by the publication in 1925[1] of a little volume entitled *The Christian Outlook, being the Sermons of an Economist.* The volume consisted of sermons and addresses, most of them delivered in churches, and two of them in cathedrals. A concluding note stated that 'any profit from the present publication will be passed on to the Birmingham Settlement, in which my wife was long and deeply interested.' Lucidity, simplicity, and sanity mark these utterances, yet that is not all; there is also profound moral emotion, for the Christian Gospel as the preacher understood it is a Gospel of personal and social righteousness, and faith in these is Christian Faith. The following passage illustrates this:

'I hold that there is much scope for conscious human purpose, for intentional direction of social forces. I can, indeed, no more theoretically reconcile evolution and human control than the philosophers can reconcile necessity and free-will. All one can hope for intellectually is a working compromise. And surely it is true that social institutions do grow very largely, spontaneously and unconsciously, out of prior conditions; and that this process, though it may be eased and expedited, cannot be altogether dispensed with. Faith can remove mountains, we are told; and there are quite high mountains that even the faith of a comparative few can remove. But to move whole mountain chains the faith of a whole population seems necessary; there are people among whom the social reformer or legislator cannot do "many mighty works, because of their unbelief . . ." But may I repeat what I have said about Love? What the Love, which is a Christian duty, does prohibit is the habit of regarding other human beings merely as instruments for our individual purposes. The essentially pagan thing is what Aristotle long ago regarded as the basis of pagan society; the treatment of any other human beings as living tools; as subserving the requirements of our own personality, our pecuniary gain, or our refinement, or even our own spiritual well-being. The

[1] Longmans, Green & Co.

man or woman who habitually lives in that frame of mind, about servants or work-people or other classes—or (let us be honest) about those who should be dearer to them—wife or husband or child—that man or woman is not a Christian. The principle is simple: "the wayfaring man, though a fool," is able to recognise it. But its application to life is difficult enough.

"How very hard it is to be
A Christian! Hard for you and me . . ."

"We know that we have passed from death unto life," says a New Testament writer, "because we love the brethren" in reality, and are not merely sentimental about them. Or let us say humbly: we shall know that we are ourselves on the right road when, and so far as, we do in fact care for the best interests of our fellows' (pp. 91-94).

We cannot forbear one more quotation from this volume. The Hon. Bertrand Russell has recently favoured the British public with a statement of the reasons why he is not a Christian. The following quotation presents briefly Sir William Ashley's *apologia* for being a Christian—a very undogmatic Christian, it is true, but yet one whom our Lord would recognise as a disciple:

'It is possible some of you may say: "No doubt this is all in the New Testament, but can it be proved to be true?" No, it cannot be conclusively proved to be the only right view of the Universe, in the sense that a mathematical problem can be proved. No accumulation of merely intellectual arguments can prove the existence of a good God, beyond the possibility of doubt. Christianity is essentially an attitude and a temper: an attitude of confidence that somehow the Universe has a good meaning, a temper of determination to help our fellow-men. Such an attitude is not inconsistent with the large lessons of human evolution, as taught us by modern science; and it is conducive to progress, as our reason conceives it. But let us be frank; to adopt such an attitude requires a venture of faith. It is as true now as when Paul wrote to the Romans that "we are saved"—our inner selves are placed in salutary relations to the Universe—"by hope," "and hope that is seen is not hope." And yet there is this confirmation by experience. Such an attitude and such a temper do bring men inward satisfaction. Men and women in all ages, who have "come to Jesus," in this sense of "learning of Him" to share in His outlook and His endeavour, have found "rest unto their souls." We dare not claim to be "righteous," and we know we are not as "true-hearted" as we might be; but yet, in the degree in which men and women have tried to be these things, the verse we have sung to-night from the psalmist is continually verified:

"There *is* sprung up a light for the righteous:
And joyful gladness for such as are true-hearted."'

H.D.A.M.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

A Free Church Modernist Conference.

On July 11—16 a notable Conference took place at Mansfield College, Oxford, to consider the Christian Faith in the light of Modern Science and Criticism. Dr. Horton and Principal Selbie initiated the Conference, and its members consisted mainly of Congregationalist scholars and ministers. There were also a few privileged guests from other denominations. The aim and spirit of the Conference is best expressed in the following passages from the prayer for guidance with which the proceedings opened:

> O God of all Truth, who by Thy Holy Spirit canst lead us into all Truth, graciously help us to find the Truth, and to make it known to others. The times are difficult for us, because a flood of knowledge has poured in on all sides, and many of the old landmarks are submerged.
>
> Things which we must surely believe, and which we cannot surrender, are entangled with things which we cannot believe, and which we know that we should surrender. But it is very difficult for us to discriminate, and to separate between the permanent and the transitory. We fear to pluck up the tares, lest we pluck up the wheat also.
>
> We pray, therefore, that Thy Church may receive Wisdom from on high. Give us leaders, scholars, students, men and women filled with the Holy Ghost, who can show convincingly how the faith once for all delivered to the saints harmonises with the knowledge of the universe, of history, of the human mind, which has poured in upon us in our time.
>
> Grant us, therefore, O Lord, Thy Holy Spirit to take the things of Jesus and to show them to us; help us to be pure in heart that we may see Thee. 'Stablish Thou the work of our hands upon us, yea the work of our hands establish Thou it.—AMEN.

After an eloquent presidential address by Dr. Horton, the Conference proper began with a paper by Principal Selbie on the validity of religious experience considered from the psychological standpoint. Dr. Selbie deprecated the tendency to stress the importance of psychology to the neglect of metaphysic. Another danger, he pointed out, arose from the predominantly pathological standpoint of the new psychology. The reality of religious experience, he insisted, cannot be explained away by psychology, though a sound psychology can assist the purgation and direction of that experience. The next paper, by Dr. R. S.

Franks, dealt with the validity of religious experience from the philosophical standpoint, and sought to show the need for postulating the being of God as the transcendent unity of the different aspects of the universe. The next group of papers dealt with the historic foundations of Christian experience. The first of these was by Prof. H. T. Andrews on the Synoptists and the primitive strata in *Acts* : the second by Prof. J. Morgan Jones on the New Testament epistles : the third by Prof. C. H. Dodd on the Fourth Gospel. This was a brilliant trilogy, but while the psychological and metaphysical treatment of the Conference subject soothed and fortified the auditors, the historical papers stimulated and perturbed them. After lively discussion the Conference passed on to consider the content of Christian experience as we know it. This was treated by Prof. N. Micklem, the Rev. T. Rhondda Williams, Mr. H. B. Shepheard, and the Rev. Arthur Pringle. Prof. Micklem's paper was characterized by much charm of style and delivery, but was weakened by an attempt to assert the authority of the *consensus fidelium* over the conscience of the individual. Mr. Rhondda Williams in a lucid paper protested against the tendency to standardize Christian experience and the striving to win the attention of modern men and women by the use of the old theological terminology. Mr. Shepheard's paper was the personal testimony of a good man to the reality of religious experience. There was a trenchancy, directness, and arresting power in Mr. Pringle's contribution which helped to clear the mind of cant. At a later stage of the Conference three of the younger clergy, the Revs. Langridge, Goodall, and Whale, were invited by Dr. Horton to give their impressions of the Conference and its message. This they did with a very happy combination of ability and modesty. Dr. Horton, whose chairmanship was characterized by a remarkable union of wisdom, urbanity, and humour, delivered the concluding address, in which he stressed the fact that the researches of scientists, historians, and literary critics had done nothing to weaken or undermine essential Christianity, and that the primary obligation of the Christian teacher to-day is to teach, not necessarily what the Bible teaches, or what the Church teaches, but the truth so far as he can patiently, perseveringly, and prayerfully learn it.

In the course of the Conference many valuable speeches were delivered by Professor Garvie, Dr. Selbie, Mr. Lenwood, Professor Turner, Dr. Cadoux, and a number of others. An intensely practical spirit permeated the body of the Conference. Whilst the truth was desired, there was great anxiety to secure the truth in such a form that it might not only illuminate the mind, but also provide moral and spiritual strength for those to whom it was delivered, and who in their turn hoped to deliver it to others. Thus the tendency was to be edifying rather than to be strictly scientific. That is always the way of the pastoral spirit: it desires to speak the truth in love—in other words, so as to hurt no one's feelings: yet it is not easy to reconcile this with that fearless sincerity by which alone the Church can maintain its influence as a teacher of truth. New truth is not always a comfortable inmate: it oftentimes associates very badly with old truth: to realise its purpose, significance, and application demands much anxious thought. Westcott speaks of 'the expulsive power of a new affection'; there is both an expulsive power and an explosive power possessed by new truth which makes it difficult stuff to handle.

The first Modernist Free Church Conference passed off happily without either expulsions or explosions. This was not because new truth was not handled at the Conference, but because the leaders of the Conference, especially its Chairman and the readers of papers, exhibited a high degree of practical wisdom.

Daily services were held in Mansfield College Chapel, and the Conference closed with a corporate celebration of the Holy Communion. The male members of the Conference were accommodated at Keble College and dined nightly in Keble Hall. What the delightful college portraits of John Keble and his contemporaries and successors in the Oxford Movement thought of the proceedings, who shall say?

The Conference was undoubtedly a real success, and promises more for the reunion of Christendom and the expansion of Christianity than many conferences summoned primarily to promote those ends. It was essentially liberating and also sufficiently inspiring to lead to the resolution to hold another next year. The most notable of the Conference papers will be pub-

lished in the *Congregational Quarterly*,[1] and we are sure that many who had not the privilege of hearing them will be glad to read them.

Reunion Efforts and Prospects.

Christian reunion is coming again to the fore, although it has just received a grievous set-back in Britain by the Wesleyan Methodists' rejection of the laboriously prepared scheme for reunion between themselves and the Primitive Methodists and the United Methodists.

The meeting of more than five hundred representatives of some ninety Christian denominations at Lausanne this month to consider not simply federal, but organic, Christian unity is an event of immense significance. After the failure of the Lambeth Pan-Anglican proposals for reunion in 1920, it would be injudicious to expect any very definite result from Lausanne. The refusal of the Roman Church to take any part in the Conference has rather alarmed Anglo-Catholics lest, by the sacrifice of Catholic principles, Lausanne should promote a huge Pan-Protestant Church. Our Anglo-Catholic friends need feel no alarm. The Conference is on too vast a scale to achieve anything practical. It will ventilate views, affirm principles, promote friendships, but it can do nothing more than that and decide to re-assemble at some future date. Practical reunion has to be achieved on a small scale before it can be achieved on a great one, and as a preliminary a vast advance in Christian education has to be made. This will take some years at least; possibly a generation or two. When a high Christian cultural level has been reached in the divided denominations, reunion, at least in the form of inter-communion, will come about almost as a matter of course. Meanwhile, besides devoting ourselves to the work of modern Christian education, we ought to give all the support in our power to efforts to secure reunion within the smaller spheres. Of these efforts one of no little importance and significance is being made in South India. If realised, this scheme, as the *Church Times* points out, 'will vitally affect the Church at home as well as in India' (July 22, 1927; p. 119).

[1] Congregational Memorial Hall, London, E.C. 4. Price 2/6 net.

The South India reunion discussions have been going on for some eight years past, largely under the leadership of the Bishop of Dornakal. The denominations concerned are the Anglican Church, the South India United Church (consisting of Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Dutch Reformed), and the Wesleyan Church. The successive conferences have witnessed a steady approach towards agreement. The Bishop of Bombay, as reported in *The Guardian* (July 22, 1927; p. 557), records agreement on the following points:

> The Apostles' and Nicene Creeds have been accepted by all as a sufficient statement of faith and basis of fellowship; the two greater Sacraments are to be administered with unfailing use of Christ's words and elements; and, most significant of all, after the union all future ministers will be episcopally ordained. So there will be continuity with the historic episcopate. Although the non-episcopal churches in South India might not have our idea of the episcopate, they recognized its value, and felt that in Holy Orders grace was truly given. There must necessarily be a difficult time of transition, since many of the existing ministers quite naturally felt that to submit to re-ordination would be a denial of former spiritual experience and a severe trial to the faith of their flocks.

The 'time of transition' it is proposed to limit to fifty years, after which no one who has not received episcopal ordination will be permitted to minister in the United Church. Meanwhile, no one shall minister temporarily in any church or congregation without the consent of the parish minister and the congregation, or shall be transferred to any new congregation without the consent of the congregation and the bishop. As for Confirmation, it is not to be insisted on as a preliminary to the reception of the Holy Communion. No doubt in time it will become a universal practice, but to insist on it now would be injudicious. The Eucharist ministered by those who had not been episcopally ordained might, if viewed from the Catholic standpoint, be deemed irregular, but it could not be held to be invalid. The validity of the Sacrament, as the Bishop of Bombay has pointed out, depends on God and the Spirit of the recipient.

Although the *Church Times* seems to regard this reunion scheme as involving the surrender of Catholic principle, the vast majority of Church people will, we are sure, be ready to give it their ardent support and earnestly to desire its consummation.

THE LETTERS OF BARON VON HÜGEL*

By Professor Percy Gardner, Litt.D., F.B.A.

MANY of the friends and admirers of Baron von Hügel—and they are numerous in every branch of the Church, from Roman Catholics to Quakers—have been looking forward to the publication of his letters, as likely to throw light on the perplexed history of the Christian faith in the present century. It was known how extensive was the circle of his correspondents, and how distinguished they were; and those who had been honoured by receiving letters from him knew how marvellous they were for insight, for sincerity, for sympathy. The first feeling of these friends on opening Mr. Bernard Holland's volume may be a certain disappointment. The selection does not include more than a small proportion of the letters which the Baron wrote, and, generally speaking, they are those written to less important personalities. One can easily imagine that the recipients of his letters, especially if they belonged to so strictly disciplined a church as the Roman, would be hardly willing to see exposed to ordinary readers documents so intimate. Moreover, to read a letter to a notable person without having to compare with it the letter to which it is a reply cannot be wholly satisfactory. Mr. Holland says that the whole correspondence between von Hügel and Tyrrell is preserved, and may, some day, be published; but the letters to Tyrrell inserted in the present volume are by no means, in my judgment at least, the most interesting. Tyrrell was a brilliant but a very erratic figure; he had not anything like the depth of thought and the solidity of character of his correspondent.

The most valuable of the published letters are those, often addressed anonymously, which throw light on the depth of the writer's mind and the breadth of his sympathy. To use von Hügel's own phrases, the book is one not to be read, but to be browsed on; to be absorbed like a lozenge, not swallowed like a pill. If the letters are thus read, few who are really interested

**Baron Friedrich von Hügel.* Selected letters, 1896-1924. Edited with a memoir by Bernard Holland. (Dent & Sons, 1926: price 30/-.)

in religion will be disappointed with them. For they mirror one of the most interesting religious personalities of our time, and his attitude in the face of all the crossing currents of life and doctrine in the Christian church. It is the contending of the currents which gives a special interest to the biography.

On his father's side, the Baron came of a race of Austrian nobles, deeply attached to the Church of Rome; on his mother's side he went back to a Scottish and Presbyterian ancestry. His education and mental habits were thoroughly German, though not Prussian; he considered that in systematic and philosophic thought the great writers of Germany were far above those of other countries. His letters were written in English, French, German, or Italian; but it is clear that he thought in German, and his sentences were moulded in German fashion. But he lived and married in England, and was strongly attached to English ideas of liberty and progress. Keats has been called 'the poets' poet.' I should be disposed to call von Hügel 'the theologians' theologian.'

Was Baron von Hügel a Modernist? It is really impossible to classify him otherwise, though, like many Modernists, he did not like the term, and was strongly opposed to the merely negative school. At p. 334 of the *Letters* he defines his own position. He says that there are two ways of regarding religion:

> *'La Religion conçue comme phénomène purement introhumain, non evidentiel au delà des aspirations de la race humaine; et la Religion conçue comme essentiellement evidentielle, métaphysique, l'effet en nous de plus que nous.'*

He, of course, accepts the latter view; but in place of the dangerous term *métaphysique* one might suggest *supernatural* or *real* as more satisfactory. If Modernism consists in a determination to accept the verified conclusions of science, of history and psychology, and to modify in their light the traditional expressions of theology, then he was clearly a Modernist.

In fact, his views both in history and philosophy are in essence those of the Modernists, whether of the Roman or the English Church. He writes to a lady:[1]

> 'You tell me that you could not truthfully profess belief in certain supposed historical facts. I suppose these to be the Virgin Birth, the

[1] p. 348.

> Bodily Resurrection, the Johannine miracles, at least primarily. But pray note that, even so, *you can still retain the more general and the bed-rock principle of the Catholic mind.'*

He goes on to say that 'some historical happenings are essential ingredients of every powerful and at all perfect religion'; but that his correspondent might well, without adding at all to her accepted list of historic beliefs retain an outlook possessing the fundamental Catholic quality. This is, of course, a view of the historic element in Christianity very different from that accepted by conservative institutional religion.

In regard to the relativity of religious knowledge, and the philosophic pathway from relativity to reality, the views of von Hügel are, perhaps, not free from obscurity or even inconsistency. He mentions[2] the distinction between quantitative and qualitative conceptions on which Canon Streeter, in his able recent work on *Reality*, lays so much stress. But he also quotes with approval the view of Eucken.

> 'What God is in Himself, we, strictly speaking, do not know. All our true knowledge of Him is limited to what He is to us, and in us.'

Yet it is clear that the writer had a most vivid sense of the objective reality of God; 'the sense of the objective, full reality of God, and the need of adoration are quite essential to religion.' Philosophers have tried many ways of rising from the immanent to the transcendent Deity; and, so long as the end of the journey is reached, the path is not a matter of the first importance.

The great problem (a problem not a theorem) of von Hügel's life was to find a way of reconciling perfect freedom of thought in matters of science and history with keen attachment to the Roman Catholic way of life, the life of a lay *dévot*, with masses, devotions and retreats. It is the same problem which vexed his friends Loisy and Tyrrell, who ended outside the Roman pale. It is not easy to understand how, after the clear and definite pronouncements of Pope Pius X, anyone could suppose that the Roman hierarchy would tolerate Modernism in any form, but some devoted Catholics have gone on, and are still going on, with the attempt to solve the in-

[2] p. 90.

soluble. Their scientific conscience will not allow them to accept the definite views of the Roman hierarchy as regards the inspiration of the Bible and the history of the early Church: but at the same time they cannot give up the Catholic way of life, which is very highly organised and penetrates every act and feeling of the votary. Hence, unless the Roman Curia definitely excommunicates them, they cling to Rome, often at the cost of much concealment, and sometimes even of what a rigid judge might call hypocrisy. I would not myself call it by any harsh name: every man of sensibility must in a measure sympathize with them. And every Anglican should rejoice that in the English Church there is no despotic authority, no stone wall against which one is hopelessly brought up. Uutil some way is found for reconciling religious authority with free thought, the desire of holiness with the love of truth, this unhappy state of things must persist. For such a way almost all Christian thinkers are looking, but none of them can as yet say that he has found one which is acceptable to the mass of wise and pious men in England or elsewhere.

In one luminous although rather involved passage,[3] von Hügel sets forth his own view of the relations between science and religion:

> 'If Science and Religion really produce interchangeable results, and you, notwithstanding, remain definitely religious, you will have, after all, to ask the Scientists more than as such they give—indeed, I am sure, more than they *can* give. For all Science, and in the term I include history, psychology, etc., is essentially the ceaseless seeking, the ceaseless restating, the ceaseless discovering of error, and the substituting of something nearer to the truth. I do not see how Science can be asked to start with a definite God, with a definite future life, with anything like a Church; I think it cannot even end with anything more than a vague reverence and sense of a deep background—a very elementary Theism will at best, and can hardly, be reached by it. Now Religion, on the contrary, begins with a full affirmation of a Reality, of a Reality other and more than all mankind. It is certain of God, certain of Christ, certain of the Church. It is a gift from above downwards, not a groping from below upwards. Assimilate Religion to Science, and you have levelled down to something which, though excellent for Science, has taken from Religion its entire force and good. On the other hand, force Science up to the level of Religion, or think you have done so, and Science affirms far more than, as such, it can affirm; and you on your part are in a world of unreality. The two things are quite uninterchangeable.'

[3] p. 353. I omit a few sentences.

This statement is excellent, but it tempts one to discussion and limitation. I will confine myself to two very obvious comments. First, to the writer the word Religion stands for the faith of the Roman Church, or at all events for Institutional and Sacramental Christianity. And second, what if, as is often the case, science and accepted religion are definitely in conflict? For example, the Roman Church asserts that the Pentateuch was written by Moses; scientific criticism proves that it was not. It is a definite collision between Authority and science. And Authority is prepared to use force to establish its view. In the case of Protestants the collisions are less abrupt, but they are of the same kind. And it is just in this field of collisions or overlappings that our perplexities arise.

But I will not cite further extracts to exhibit the religious attitude of the writer. The letters were not usually written for that purpose, nor is that the best side of them. They are full of valuable *obiter dicta*. And the best of them, in my opinion, are those written to young men and girls, not to explain intellectual difficulties, but to encourage and help them in the life of religion. In these letters the character of the writer, surely one of the most humble, gentle, sympathetic that can be found, is fully displayed. We constantly come upon such phrases as 'I have learned,' 'I appreciate,' 'I admire.' Von Hügel was not above learning even from men and women whom he must have known to be at a much lower intellectual level than his own. His letters usually begin on a note of warm praise or delicate appreciation: if he has reproof to administer, or criticism to make, it comes in the shadow of commendation, and is put in so tactful a form that it could not be resented. I will cite a few examples of weighty sayings and of wise spiritual counsel. It is hard to select: in fact, on almost every page there is something that claims to be taken to heart and remembered, but space is limited, and a few specimens will show the richness of the mine.

The subject of prayer is one on which a man whose life was so largely spent in prayer, both as an action and an attitude, is an undeniable authority. He sees that prayer implies not only communion with God, but communion with other souls.[4]

[4] pp. 269-271.

'Souls, all human souls, are deeply interconnected.' 'We can not only pray for each other, but suffer for each other.' 'Nothing is more real than this interconnection—this gracious power put by God into the very heart of our infirmities.' 'And so, most really, to try and help on the life of another soul means a specially large double death to self on the part of the life-bringing soul.'

Another deep psychological observation bears upon some of the keenest controversies of the day[5]:

'As far as I know, there does not exist any good book dealing exclusively and systematically with the Psychology of Women. What I have come to know of this difficult, elusive, although very real and very important subject-matter, has had to be gained from incidental remarks or short passages in various psychology or philosophy books, from the description of women in great plays and great novels, from female letter-writers, and, above all, from direct personal observation.'

We know that the schools dominant in regard to human nature will scarcely allow that women have a different psychology from that of men; to allow it would bring danger to the slogan of the equality of the sexes. But one who, like the present reviewer, has had hundreds of pupils, both male and female, will discover, unless blinded by prepossession, that the differences both moral and intellectual between men and women are as pronounced as the differences between their bodies, which latter women are at present doing their best to obliterate. Until a sound psychology of women is established we run the greatest risks of rearing our social and political fabrics on a foundation, not of stone, but of sand.

Another profound remark cited by von Hügel as made to him by a friend distinguishes between zest and excitement.[6]

'The soul's health and happiness depend upon a maximum of *zest*, and as little as possible of *excitement*. Zest is the pleasure which comes from thoughts, occupations, etc., that fit into, and are continuous applications, etc. of, extant habits and interests of a good kind—duties and joys that steady us and give us balance and centrality. Excitement is the pleasure which comes from breaking loose, from fragmentariness, from losing our balance and centrality. Zest is natural warmth, excitement is fever heat, and that side shows (side-tracks?) *queer* things religiously; all that is not central, sober, balanced may indeed help certain souls in certain ways; but for ourselves we should carefully eschew being drawn into attending to them, and thus weakening our own *centrality*.'

There is a fine passage in regard to suffering.[7]

'How wonderful it is, is it not (Is it not? is very characteristic) that literally only Christianity has taught us the true peace (place?)

[5] p. 255. [6] p. 308. [7] p. 228.

and function of suffering. The Stoics tried the hopeless little game of denying its objective reality, or of declaring it a good in itself, which it never is; and the Pessimists attempted to revel in it, as a food to their melancholy, and as something that can no more be transformed than it can be avoided or explained. But Christ came, and He did not really explain it; He did far more, He met it, willed it, transformed it; and He taught us how to do all this, or rather He Himself does it within us, if we do not hinder the all-healing hands.'

This is the verdict of an expert. Throughout his life von Hügel constantly suffered from severe illness; he suffered also from deafness, which, beyond other ailments, tends to produce depression, since it cuts one off from human intercourse; and the misfortunes and death of friends deeply hurt his sensitive nature; but his spirit rose above all these trials, so that he seemed to live in the pure light of the presence of God.

There is a charming page on the subject of preparing to meet the difficulties and desolation which encompass the arduous path of self-devotion. Von Hügel says that there dwelt in his mind three images, learnt from Jesuit or Dominican teachers. The first is that of the mountain-climber, who advances with quiet, regular steps over rock and slope, never hurrying, but ready if a thick mist comes to pause for a while. The second is that of a voyager at sea, who in the calm will select and fix in appropriate places the few things necessary for daily life, that in the time of storm and stress they may always be at hand. The third is that of one crossing the desert on a camel, who learns when a hurricane comes on to throw himself on his face in the sand, covering up his face and so abiding until the storm is over.[8]

'There is one crucial point, to form no conclusions, to take no decisions, to change nothing during such crises, and especially at such times not to force any particularly religious mood or idea in (on?) oneself. To turn to other things, to maintain a vague general attitude of resignation, to be very meek with oneself and with others: the crisis goes by thus with great fruit.' 'It is far, far more God who must hold us than we who must hold Him. And we get trained in these darknesses into that sense of our impotence without which the very presence of God becomes a snare.'

As I have already observed, no writings better exhibit the great qualities of von Hügel, the breadth and depth of his spirituality, his power of sympathy, his lovingness of nature, than the letters to young people, nieces, god-children and

[8] p. 305.

others; especially those addressed to G.G. It was a great privilege to be treated by him with such epistolary intimacy. Some of his correspondents were Anglican; in fact, far from exhibiting the usual contempt of Romans for the English Church, he seems to have found in it some of his closest religious affinities. But yet the tendencies of his fathers lie deeper than those inherited from his mother's forbears. He hardly extends his tolerance to Puritans and to Quakers, while in the other direction he does not find the veneration of the relics of saints revolting. Milton he cannot abide, and regards him as a less Christian writer than Shakespeare. Of Browning he had a very high opinion.

It is noteworthy that not only does von Hügel abstain from any attempt at making converts to Rome, but he defends such abstention. He cites the example of a Roman Catholic Bishop, who said that he was very cautious in such matters, since he had seen 'how easy it is to disturb souls from out of what contains much truth, which they can and do assimilate to their spiritual profit, and to push and strain them up to something to which they are not really called.' But no doubt the Roman proselytizers will use the writings of von Hügel as they do those of Newman, to attract Protestants, while they do not in fact approve them. They seem to regard those writings as goods not suitable for home consumption, but fit for dumping in foreign countries. But the Roman machine is so powerful that it seems to matter little by what door converts enter into the fold: they are soon moulded after the pattern adopted by the central authority, and, indeed, often acquire a narrow and propagandist spirit which is less usual among those who are born into the Roman Church.

It is often thought and said of the Modernists that they put forth a mutilated and reduced Christianity, that they are wanting in fervour, and even that their ideas of morality are loose. To these accusations no better reply can be made than by referring the objectors to the life and letters of Friedrich von Hügel.

THE CHILDREN'S CHURCH

SINCE starting our 'Children's Church' in the autumn of 1923 I have heard of a good many similar experiments. In some cases these Churches can hardly be regarded as experiments; they appear to be established parochial organizations, and I am even inclined to suspect that there are again others which have flourished and have had their day. The title might lead one to suppose uniformity in plan if not in function, but if there is one originator with his conception of the model scheme —and I am told there is, though he has been given two distinct names and an address in two opposite ends of England—then the developments have been so various that puzzled enquirers still ask if the Children's Church means necessarily a Church built for a congregation of young people, or a corner set apart for their private devotions, or an afternoon service conducted by the curate with boys to read the Lessons, or a gathering of children in an unconsecrated building under the superintendence of a layman; for it may mean any of these things and possibly other things besides. In our case it means the last, only it is a laywoman, not a man.

It has fallen to my lot through the changes and chances of life to have held Bible Classes for big boys and girls in town and country, and superintended Sunday Schools both for children and infants, and over a space of time now numbering nearly thirty years; so that I can claim a certain amount of knowledge and presumably of sympathy with Sunday School work; and therefore when I introduce myself as the three-year-old 'Leader' of a Children's Church, I shall not, I hope, be regarded doubtfully by the many—and would there were many more!—who serve the schools Sunday by Sunday, rain and shine, throughout the length and breadth of England. In our own case the Children's Church has in no way superseded the Sunday School. We hold our Children's Church service on Sunday morning, and the schools meet in the afternoon.

Perhaps a Sunday School has this advantage over a Children's Church in that its system should ensure more individual

attention. It ought not to be possible in a Sunday School for one single child to be overlooked. You have, say, a teacher to every eight or ten children. Each child is marked for attendance, and, if absent, the reason can promptly be discovered and the home visited. Each child can be separately questioned and instructed, corrected, encouraged, watched, loved, prayed for, struggled over; in fact, an incalculable amount of good can be done by a really keen, purposeful Sunday School teacher in that Sunday hour, not forgetting those extra moments given to 'looking up' the pupils and to friendly greetings in the street. I remember an excellent rule in force in a certain Sunday School many years ago, where quarterly report cards were taken to the homes—not given out to the children in class, and not sent round by the servant, but taken by each teacher—the eight or ten cards, the number of 'attendances' correctly filled in, a word or two relative to 'conduct' signed by the teacher, counter-signed (if I recollect aright) by the Incumbent of the Church. I remember also one teacher, in my young eyes a model of justice and regularity, who invited her scholars two by two to tea in the garden, each couple once, during the summer Sundays — the Trinity Sundays, when all the flowers grow as they please and even religion may idle a little.

But no such smooth and equal plan is possible in a Children's Church, not at least as I know it. There we have one 'Leader,' as we call her ('Vicar' sometimes, for the sake of argument) to a congregation of between one and two hundred children, and it will be strange if nobody is neglected. Opportunities for individual instruction and friendly intercourse can be made, but they have to be made. In the Sunday School they naturally occur. Granting this at the outset, let us turn to three advantages in the Children's Church which seem to me, after this, not long but neither so very short experience, to lie inherent in the scheme and to be well worth the trouble of digging out to examine and profit thereby.

There is the Electoral Roll. At the age of ten any boy or girl may ask for a simple form to fill in, giving name, address, date of birth and place of baptism; nor does it suffice to state that you were baptized in Manchester or Yarmouth or Toller Porcorum; you must make sure that it was St. John's, or the Parish

Church, or—if it happens to be so—the Congregational Chapel, or privately at home. Curious facts are elicited through the filling in of these forms, and if the form is taken away and is a long time coming back—' not lost but cannot be found '—then I begin to scent the real difficulty, and by tactful suggestion bring all parties round to a cheerful admission of the fact that this one particular member of the family was by some mysterious oversight left out; and so having climbed down from the top story of a valid and positive christening to a lower one of uncertain circumstance, they land comfortably on the solid foundation of deciding that the rite has never been performed at all, that they have always secretly wanted it to ' be done,' and will be only too thankful now if you will make all necessary arrangements, more particularly thankful when it has come to their sure and certain knowledge that the Canadian Government will not admit unbaptized young people to its shores!

Now, it would be quite possible to introduce a system of this sort into a Sunday School, but it is not conveniently inherent in the scheme. You can teach a boy about Moses and St. Paul and even the Church Catechism without ever necessarily asking him if he has been baptized. He may have been passed on to you from a lower class where you presume that all is well, or hail from an exemplary Sunday School in another parish, or he may even be solo boy in the choir, and some day a horrified curate preparing him for Confirmation makes the discovery that he has been slipping through at all the little joins along his life, and, thinking it over, almost unavoidably. Nobody is to blame, except perhaps the very first ecclesiastically-minded person who set foot in the home after the child was born; and supposing the best of the family at that time were down with mumps, tied up heads greeting you in the doorway, or a handsome sailor son has just returned from three years abroad, would it not have to be an even more ecclesiastically-minded person to sit in judgment and say that Baptism should have been the first thought of the other perhaps rather elastically ecclesiastically-minded person? And after that, the blame can be deposited nowhere in particular. Neither boys nor girls nor parents want to be asked every five minutes for full and precise details of the family christenings. It savours of impertinence and possibly of dark suspicions. But

with the Electoral Roll system once and for all the question comes automatically. When you are ten years old, or at any age onwards up to eighteen, *if you want a vote* you must sign a paper, evidence of your membership of the Church of England, yes, even if you are the Rector's own daughter or the son of a High Church Peer; and it is you who are looking after your vote, not we who are looking after your Baptism. In the same way it may be seen without further elaboration that the Roll provides an obvious excuse for calling on runaway members, an obvious excuse and also a beneficial reminder when, by reference to it, boys and girls are found to be approaching the age for Confirmation, or, later again, the date when they may be pursued with a properly printed blue-green form and passed on to the Roll of the Parish. But I must not linger here.

To dig out the second advantage, there is the employment, *necessary* employment, of a good number of bigger boys and girls. In our own case we have sixteen on our Council (this includes the two churchwardens), fourteen sidesmen, a choir of girls, a small orchestra, two young people responsible each Sunday for fitting up the Altar, and two for arranging the flowers in the Altar vases. Besides these offices, there are opportunities, as in the case of the Parochial Councils, for any member of the congregation to serve on committees. I have emphasized the *necessity* of all this employment. In a Sunday School you would rather have to create employment and office, but in the Children's Church the offices and activities are a natural growth out of the system and form of government. A service has to be conducted on Sunday morning; someone must get the hall ready; someone must superintend the seating of the congregation, which enters promiscuously and not like a school; meanwhile, from the fiddlers who have tuned themselves to the piano we shall expect some Boyce or Handel or Gustav Holst; and when once the service has begun it has got to be kept going—Responses, Psalms, Canticles, Hymns, Lessons. Then there are pages to be found in the books for children who cannot find them for themselves; you want sensible boys in charge of the door, dependable boys for taking the offertory, for counting the money afterwards and seeing to the safe disposal of it; and from first to last the service must go with decent order, because that is

n the very name and nature of the Order of Morning Prayer. And our church activities mean necessary employment too. The money safely disposed must be sent off to the object to which it has been allotted; there is necessary correspondence, filing of receipts, keeping of accounts. Nobody ever heard of a missionary box being handed round in church, and the contents called for once a year. It might be done in Sunday School, where there is no special opportunity for an offertory in the scheme, but it cannot be done in church. And to show that our Council and Committees are not busy over nothing in particular, I will give the agenda of our last Council meeting, which happens to be the first meeting of the newly-elected members for 1927 :

1. Minutes.
2. To elect a Vice-Chairman and Hon. Secretary.
3. To co-opt one boy and one girl.
4. To fix date and make arrangements for the election of 'People's' Warden and fourteen sidesmen.
5. To re-elect the following Committees: (*a*) Finance; (*b*) Dr. Barnardo's; (*c*) Australian Settlers' Literature; (*d*) Tennis; (*e*) Library. (A new Committee was also formed in connection with a Housing Scheme in Albania which had taken the fancy of the 'Vicar's' Warden.)
6. Offertories. (This is a big business. On that occasion we had to decide if we should add anything on to certain recent offertories, six in number, out of our Church Fund, or by additional offertories, before despatch; and also we had to allocate offertories for nine Sundays ahead.)
7. Letter of thanks for gift of candlesticks (from former member of the congregation).

Notice the Tennis Committee. There is always a tournament to get up, and the Tennis Club has formed an agreeable habit of giving a New Year's Dance. All this means business.

The employment of older boys and girls on necessary work is no doubt the secret of keeping what is called a 'hold over them.' They are responsible for so much. Consider the duties which may devolve on some of these elders at election time. The nomination list must be made out and posted on the church door by a certain date, nomination papers must be cyclostyled, pencils must be supplied; someone must be at the table during the voting hours to see to requirements and answer questions; a second someone must tick off the name of each voter from the Roll as a

voting paper is handed out by a third, and so on, and so on; and there must be no mistakes. Efficiency! Efficiency! As the clock strikes the polling station opens; as the clock strikes the polling station must close. We open ours from 4.15 to 5 p.m., so that the children can come running in from school, and again from 7.30 to 8 for bigger boys and girls who have been home from work and 'changed.' We have properly appointed 'tellers' counting all the time, and the poll is announced at a church meeting as soon after eight as possible. As a proof that these things can be taken seriously, I heard perhaps a couple of days after one of our elections that an eleven-year-old voter whom I had chanced to observe in the little crowd had since undergone a sudden and serious operation. He had been in great pain on the day of the election, and it meant a long walk, but, as his mother kept saying, 'he *would* go to vote.' Not a remarkable boy in any way (unless in that way!), a quiet country child, yet I suppose there stirred in him some little bit of public spirit. Perhaps more noteworthy still is the case of another small boy, rarely seen, alas! at our Sunday services, who arrived on his smart little bicycle at the polling station, walked in, recorded his vote in silence and silently rode off again. He might care nothing for the Christian religion (and I sometimes wonder if children who possess smart bicycles at that early age *can* really care for the Christian religion), but he had been canvassed, one could see that, and he meant his friend to get in.

Then who but the bigger boys and girls are responsible for the tone of the congregation? If they do not come with a sense of purpose, a wish to see the little ones properly taught and trained, and to take their share of preserving peace and order and an atmosphere in which such teaching and training are possible, they clearly had better stay away. Hence fortunately the growing boys and girls lose self-consciousness; they have not come ostensibly for the salvation of their own shy souls, but for the sake of 'the children.' It is a 'Children's Church,' and though many a word must go home to boys and girls who are rapidly passing into manhood and womanhood, yet it is 'the children' whose needs we are supposed to be considering.

So with an Electoral Roll and plenty of necessary occupation we find ourselves working on a system which seems to have

greater opportunities for life and expansion and development than the system of the Sunday School. And meanwhile a good deal can be said for the educational opportunity. I am not now thinking of the opportunity for learning on a small scale from this church in miniature what it may one day be very useful to know, procedure and business and powers under the Enabling Act, but I am thinking of Church doctrine, Bible teaching, and so forth. And this brings me to my third point. For though I began by saying that the Sunday School had the advantage of individual instruction, great as this advantage undoubtedly is, one difficulty threatens again and again to nullify it, the difficulty of getting a sufficient number of competent teachers; and if you cannot get your requisite number, it seems to me to point to a Children's Church. One, surely, can be found for the leadership, able and willing; but possibly not half-a-dozen, for 'able' means a good deal if you include circumstance and condition, and so does 'willing.' Granted that your one is secured, what then *is* the educational opportunity claimed above for this system?

The easiest way to answer that question is to suppose that I am taking Matins, as I hope to be, say, on the 27th of this next November, which is Advent Sunday and also St. Andrewstide. I shall of course choose for the introductory sentence, 'Repent ye,' explaining the reason why. I can draw attention to 'Thou Child' in the *Benedictus*. I can point to the rubrick concerning the magnificent and bright-shining Advent collect, which is for this day and all the ensuing days up to the holy peace of Christmas. I can ask if there was anything in the *Te Deum* which might be connected with thoughts of St. Andrew ('The glorious company of the Apostles,' 'The noble army of Martyrs'); and I can make occasion by the very absence of special missionary prayers in our present Book to give a new value to 'Thy saving health unto all nations.' Much of this will be done with the children seated comfortably 'finding their places.' When it comes to praying I can use discretion as to the number of prayers (*e.g.*, the Collect for Peace *or* the Collect for Grace), esteeming it better to be quiet during a few than restless or rebellious during many. Then I can select what Psalms and Lessons I please, and I shall have fifteen minutes for an address, so that by careful fore-

thought and preparation I should be able to make of that service rather too much than not enough of a chance for instruction. Meanwhile, by mere use of the Prayer Book without comment the children are unconsciously possessing themselves of a wonderful heritage of Christian scholarship; they are also acquiring habits of reverence without which there is little hope of knowledge; and provided I do not ruin everything by dulness and gloom—two things which children cannot endure—they are likely to carry away with them very happy memories of their early religious experiences, stray beautiful sayings and words will abide, a real love of the Church, a feeling of Home all the world over.

DOROTHY V. WHITE.

JAMES WARD: AN APPRECIATION

By R. W. MACAN, D.Litt., Master of University College, Oxford.

THE volume of James Ward's *Essays* recently published[1] should not be overlooked by Modern Churchmen, least of all by the more metaphysical among them. The *Memoir* of Ward's life will mightily intrigue open-minded theologians, especially in its earlier phases; while the rest of the volume may constitute, for those not yet familiar with Ward's larger works, an attractive introduction to a philosophic achievement of singularly spiritual texture. The *Essays* here collected and arranged in approximately chronological order — most of them, indeed, already printed elsewhere but not so easily accessible—furnish a gentler approach to Ward's philosophic position than either series of his Gifford Lectures, to say nothing of the monumental *Principles of Psychology*; and the perusal of these papers must gain many readers for the study of the larger and more systematic treatises just mentioned. Ward's sovran doctrine—as it may, perhaps, be called—of the indissoluble marriage of Subject and Object in a spiritual union, though primarily a transfiguration of

[1] *Essays in Philosophy by James Ward,* Late Professor of Mental Philosophy at Cambridge, Fellow of the British Academy and Corresponding Member of the Institute of France. With a Memoir of the author by Olwen Ward Campbell, Cambridge University Press, 1927. 8vo. pp. xii, 372. 16*s*. net.

the Kantian *Erkenntnistheorie*, is capable of enlargement and is by him virtually enlarged into a justification of the ultimate Realities, which are the *raisons d'être* of Science, of Ethics, of Religion. Few among our recent philosophers have done more to arm the modern defence of Christianity with first principles than has James Ward, however uncovenanted his own piety may have been at the last. Nor should it escape readers of *The Modern Churchman* that there was a crisis in Ward's life, while he was still a Congregational minister, when he could write to his most intimate friend as follows: 'You see whereabouts I am: too heretical in theory for the Evangelicals, too evangelical practically for the Unitarians. There is but one place where I should be at home, *i.e.*, in the *Broad* Church section of the Church of England.' The Thirty-nine Articles were, however, rather too much for him. In a later generation, and in a more genial environment, who knows but that James Ward might have found satisfaction in the experiments of our Anglican community!

The twelve essays collected in this volume are described by the judicious editors, Professors Sorley and Stout, as 'popular,' that is to say, 'not severely technical': but they are not all equally easy reading, and No. X for example, on *Einstein and Epistemology*, here published for the first time, while ministering some consolation to psychologists or metaphysicians who have suspected a screw loose somewhere in the neo-physicists' doctrine of Relativity, may perhaps prove itself 'caviare to the general.' The Editorial claim, that the Essays as a whole exhibit 'a characteristic unity,' is more easily conceded; albeit a casual reader might hardly realize from these Essays, taken alone, that Ward's chief and most original contributions to philosophy were made as a psychologist. The omission of technical papers on psychology from the present volume is fully justified by considerations advanced in the Preface; but it weakens the title of this selection of essays to be regarded as a philosophical autobiography; and, in any case, the tale here begins too late. Such an autobiography should comprise a Genesis and Exodus as well as a Leviticus and Numbers. The earliest paper included in this volume dates from 1879, when Ward was thirty-six years of age, and had reached in essentials

the position which he saw no reason to change during the remainder of his life. These *Essays* do indeed represent the arc of Ward's philosophical vision for the latter half of his life-time; and you might lay 'The Realm of Nature' (his better title for the Gifford Lectures published in 1899) and 'The Realm of Ends' (the Gifford Lectures published in 1911) as the right and left foundation-stones of this semi-circle of essays, and drop the 'Psychological Principles' (1918) into the junction of the ascending archway as its key-stone, and so obtain a complete view of Ward's system of organized experience, or 'knowledges,' so uniform were his method and standpoint throughout the period represented by these *Essays*. But he had reached that maturity with immense difficulty, through years of intellectual storm and actual distress, a knowledge of which is vital to the understanding of the man and his full message. Such knowledge had been lost to view but for the thrilling narrative of his *Wanderjahre*, presented in the all too brief *Memoir*—so candid, so attractive, so complete in its way—from the pen of his daughter, Mrs. Campbell. We should hardly have expected from the author of *Shelley and the Unromantics*, with its flame and flow, the serenity, the deep charm, of this biography in little: a quiet lakelet after that torrent, Wordsworth's Rydal, for Southey's Lodore.

'Lord! what fools these mortals be,' chirps the immortal Puck: and what agonies of mind those mid-Victorians endured! Searchings of spirit at Birmingham or Liverpool, struggles with *Kultur* at Berlin or Göttingen! James Ward's experience was exemplary, with added touches of misery from his domestic circumstances and from his own make-up. Poverty, ill-health, religiosity made his life wretched for the first thirty years or so. Hounds of heaven and worms of earth worried his soul, till he turned on them and beat or brushed them off. His pilgrimage was, indeed, a Divine Comedy of a sort. This story, too (like every good and complete story), has a beginning, a middle, and an end.

Born in Liverpool, early in 1843, in a modest station, eldest of a large family, with a pious, speculative, ruinous father and a remarkable but ill-educated mother, James Ward spent the first twenty years of his life mostly at home, under very depressing

conditions, in search of a vocation, which, after a false start in an architect's office, revealed itself to his passionate adolescence as Ordination in the Nonconformist Ministry. Such was the natural result of 'narrow Congregationalism, uncultured and Calvinistic,' upon a mind of extraordinary native force backed by a moral earnestness apt thus early to constitute him father-confessor and director to the tribe of his no less devout sisters. Yet even amid the murk and vapours of this primitive cave-dwelling the boy had dreamed childish dreams of a day when he might yet be 'a philosopher': had caught glimpses of the natural world, in which sea-gulls wailed and larks sang 'in the blinding sky'—early perceptions of nature's possibilities, which revived in after years to make him an enthusiastic field naturalist and to ease his approaches to the natural sciences.

Meanwhile, to fulfil his ministerial ambition a long and strenuous course of professional training was indicated, and amid great difficulties, financial and physical, was achieved. In September, 1863, Ward entered Spring Hill College, Birmingham (now transplanted and sublimated into Mansfield College, Oxford), and his ten years purgatory unwittingly began. How different the instruction and discipline of Spring Hill in the sixties of last century from the developments of Mansfield College to-day, celebrating just now a first Modernist Conference for Congregationalists, under the kindly eyes of the fearless Editor of *The Modern Churchman*! Six years of intense study and thought at Spring Hill, followed by an illuminative year in Germany (where Lotze, so to speak, dethroned Dorner in Ward's Bethel), found the halting heretic in Cambridge, where, after an abortive start as a probationary pastor, he re-dedicated life and mind to Philosophy, matriculated in the University as an undergraduate at the age of thirty, and was soon elected Scholar, and some two and a half years later Fellow of Trinity, for proficiency in 'The Moral Sciences' (1875). The Dissertation submitted to the examiners on this occasion was entitled 'The Relation of Physiology to Psychology'—verily an index of the revolution, or evolution, which had been accomplished in his studies and intentions during the preceding decade. This moment was the crisis of his career. His purgatory was over: the promised land was reached: the new life was begun: though

he himself hardly quite realized it. Looking back afterwards on the way he had come, while he described his twelve months spent in Germany as 'certainly the year in which I grew most,' he could stigmatize the twelve months following his election at Trinity as 'the most intellectually stagnant year of my life,' and that although a good part of it, too, was spent in Germany, this time at Leipzig in a physiological laboratory. Later still he mistook in retrospect the years from 1875 to 1883 as 'a dark and barren period' in his own biography. In fact, once and again his self-analysis was at fault! With his election at Trinity he was a made man: he had arrived: he had found his vocation: 'his practical struggles were over,' as Mrs. Campbell notes. But he must have been, for the nonce, a tired man: he needed a rest, a recuperation. His breach with the past, his renunciation of the Christian ministry—so terribly like a *gran rifiuto*—the exhausting mental labour and struggles of ten years, and more—to say nothing of the embarrassments and shock from disasters at home—all demanded time, and the formation of fresh habits, new associations, before a fuller and freer life could be consciously inaugurated. Quite happy and free for him, perhaps, life never could be. *Er ist der alte freigeborne Vogel nicht: Er hat schon Jemand angehört.* The Cambridge philosopher may have 'buried the past' and 'burned his boats': but he could barely hide his inner scars: he never, perhaps, quite achieved a perfect self-possession. (But what man ever does?) There is even something a little ungracious in the note, written more than half a century after he had abdicated the pulpit in Downing Place, Cambridge, in which, within a year of his death, he declined an invitation to be present at the Jubilee Celebration of Emmanuel Church: but, if hardly gracious, it is verily pathetic. He would not even look upon 'the tombstone of a buried life,' as that Church was to him. That tombstone marks, indeed, the parting of his life into two contrasted periods, corresponding in a sense to the dipsychism, the self-contradiction, to which he himself humbly pleaded guilty; for 'he sometimes confessed to the feeling that there were two men in him,' and even in his last year he more than once was heard to declare that 'barren philosophy had rendered him inhuman and cut him off from life.'

Of a truth, there are few pure gains in war or peace, in wealth

or in progress. Victories, achievements, honours, happiness itself will be paid for. But the last half of Ward's life, that is to say, the fifty years or so of residence in Cambridge from 1875 to 1925, presents a blameless record of strenuous industry, successful work, increasing recognition from without, and growing satisfaction within. From every point of view this was the larger half of his life, but not, perhaps, the more fascinating. If his Biography should ever be re-written in two volumes, after the tiresome example of the mid-Victorians, those fifty years will occupy the second (and larger) volume, which will prove itself the less interesting. Nothing is much duller than a chronicle of unbroken successes. In the delicately articulated *Memoir* under review, the thirty odd years of Ward's 'Becoming' occupy five of the six sections, among which his eighty-three years are distributed, and the fifty odd years of his 'Being' are accounted for in the sixth and final section: or, to put it otherwise, the half-century of his later life occupies but one-third of the ninety pages allotted to the whole. This arrangement corresponds exactly to the intrinsic merits of the case: and Mrs. Campbell has done well to treat the earlier period at relatively greater length, for to it belong, as she writes, 'the formative experiences of his life and character, though they remained utterly unknown to the larger number of those who became his friends and familiars in later life.'

That later life in the actual living was a good time, a half-century of flowers and fruits for Ward. Loyal and distinguished pupils, both men and women: friendships with the *élite* of Cambridge, the Sidgwicks, Balfours, Stuarts, Fosters (to say nothing of the anonymous, that is, those still alive): an assured and eminent academic position: a growing literary output of mature and profound significance: world-wide recognition and accumulating compliments from divers quarters: foreign travel with choice companions, and lonelier holidays with nature, to the benefit of knowledge, health, and spirits: last, not least, a house, a garden, a home of his own—he was upwards of forty when he married, but he had still a longer lease of life to run—where the old Adam in him found indulgence, if not oblivion, and the better self affections bordering on worship: does not the *Memoir* bewray it? What a sequel, what a land flowing with milk and

honey, after those three-and-thirty, if not forty, years of wandering in the wilderness!

Commenting upon a portrait of his parents Ward once wrote to a favourite sister: 'In her [the mother's] forehead the deepest wrinkles are perpendicular, and in the father's horizontal: he has made the trouble, and she has felt it.' The admirable illustrations with which this volume is adorned present Ward himself wearing the aspect of the ideal philosopher, with noble brow, unflinching eyes, a classic nose, while mouth and chin are lost in the not too tidy beard conventionally associated with profundity of thought (albeit the Florentines of Dante's day 'kept their faces distinctively human by use of the razor'). But Ward's brow is furrowed in both directions: father and mother, or it may be the two men in him, are both there, and he does not look quite happy. You note, however, that the frontispiece is dated to 1911, some fourteen years before his death, and gladly accept the assurance that 'the last ten years of his life were probably the happiest and most peaceful that he had known.' *On revient toujours*. The last thing Ward wrote, a few months before his death, was a pensive article for the *Hibbert Journal* entitled 'The Christian Ideas of Faith and Eternal Life'; his last recorded utterance was the repetition of 'a favourite quotation: Lord, now lettest Thou thy servant depart in peace.' Now, being dead, he yet speaketh. Many will endorse Professor Stout's loyal tribute: 'My debt to him . . . is too great for me to measure. It is my settled belief that there is much more in him of lasting value than I or anyone else has yet assimilated and used.' A challenge, this, to Modern Churchmen, among others. Those who have still acquaintance to make with Ward's genius could not do better than begin with this volume of Essays.

REGINALD W. MACAN.

THE EMERGENT REDEMPTION OF GIOBERTI

By the Rev. Richard de Barry, Vicar of Horton, Wimborne.

VINCENZO GIOBERTI will always command the respect of those for whom the words God and Country still have their magnetism. Born in 1801, in 1823 he took the degree of Doctor of Divinity at Turin. Always a reformer, he was at first favoured by Charles Albert, but in 1833 he was driven into exile. At Brussels in 1839, Gioberti sought to interpret the evolutionary philosophy of Spinoza and Hegel in the theistic interest in his brilliantly conceived *Intraduzione allo Studio della Filosofia.*[1] In that work the writer assumed the reality of what we now term the evolutionary process under the aegis of his 'Idea,' that is, the 'reign of law.' But he sought to save the belief in the divine transcendence—what he called '*la signoria dell' Idea sul concetto e sul senso, e dell' Ente sulle esistenze spirituali e materiali*'[2]—by combining creationism with evolutionism in a manner that somewhat anticipated Bergson and exponents of Emergent Evolution.

It will be seen that Gioberti is a Realist, not an Idealist. That is to say, while Idea is to him intrinsically necessary to Being, Being is not necessary to Idea, for Being is not simply the projection of thought after the manner of teaching of the philosophic Idealists.

Gioberti's realism, and his creative evolutionism, come out in the points of his primary rational formula (*formula razionali*), which is that *l'Ente crea le esistenze*; in Latin, *Ens creat existentias.*[3] This was intended as a theistic counter to Spinoza's '*Deus, sive Natura*' and '*Natura naturans.*' Gioberti, in part

[1] Work here quoted: Edizione seconda (in four vols.). Brusselle, 1844.

[2] 'The supremacy of the [Absolute] Idea over human conceptual and sensuous knowledge, and of the [Absolute] Being over spiritual and material existences.'

[3] Literally 'Being [*i.e.*, the Absolute Being] creates existences,' *i.e.*, is in the act of continuous creation of all existences.'

conformity with Spinoza, meant that Being, the Supreme Reality, in a living and continouus fashion, by an unfailing custom, if not by a necessary law of its structure, is constitutive of all that we see and know as 'existences,' the unfolding cosmic order. Creation, he agreed, was not an arbitrary *fiat* limited to the 'beginning of time.' It is the unending act of the projection of existences in the cosmic evolutionary order. It is not arbitrary because this projection conforms immutably with 'Idea,' or Law, which itself is intrinsic to the very essence of Being.

We find here a judicious blending of the two orthodox ideas of creation and of conservation, creation suggesting the free or personal aspect of the process and conservation suggesting the fixed or law-conforming aspect. In seeking to combine these, and to enable us to watch the Creator creating the world, according to his saying, '*Lo spirito umano e spettatore continuo, diretto e immediate, della creazione*'[4] (*op. cit.* iii, 476), Gioberti, it seems, is including together what we should call both seasonal (that is, cyclic or recurrent 'life displays') and also 'new creations.' He was thinking less, perhaps, of what Bergson calls '*l'évolution créatrice*, the springing up of new species, than of the poet's:

> Thou wak'st, O Earth,
> And work'st from change to change and birth to birth,
> Creation old as hope, and new as sight;
> For meed of toil not vain,
> Hearing once more the primal *fiat* toll:—
> 'Let there be light!'

The student of philosophy will recognise points of similarity between Gioberti's contemplation of the Creation Drama and Malebranche's claim that we see God rather than the Creature in the very act of our intending to observe the Creation around us. As will be remembered, Gioberti came under censure on this point for exaggeration, but his firm footing on the ground of historic fact saved him from falling into more serious errors.

Though Gioberti lived before the time when the problem of the Origin of Species had come to the fore, all this teaching of his might readily have fitted in with the Bergsonian Philosophy

[4] 'Man' (literally 'the mind of man') 'is a continuous, direct, and immediate witness of the creation.'

of Change and the theory that Evolution is always, *in potentia*, creative of an unending newness of species. To the Bergonian, it is a mere result of environment that in the one case his 'creative evolution' keeps to its old recurrences, or else that it breaks off from them in new syntheses.

Gioberti, however, had not had it brought home to him how crucially the problem of God's freedom, and therefore of what we call somewhat allusively His personality, is involved in the question of how new forms of life appear or emerge. It followed that he sought for his primary evidences for God's freedom and personality in another line of argument, an interesting one, but not one to commend itself to modern philosophical thinkers. In his line of argument he adapted the idea of Miracle, as he defined it, to count in the Theistic *versus* the Pantheistic outlook on the cosmos. Against Strauss, the author of the famous *Leben Jesu*, who claimed as a Pantheist that miracles could not and did not happen, Gioberti affirmed what he called the '*signoria*,' that is, the supremacy or transcendence of his 'Idea,' considered as intrinsic to Being itself, over all existences. For him, therefore, Law, itself, in essence Idea, expressing itself in the Life-Cycle, could reassert itself in overruling any 'particulars' of this Life-Cycle in some form or other of direct self-assertiveness. To him such over-rulings of 'Law-in-concrete' by 'Law-in-essence' were what are known as the Biblical miracles. God's personality was the fact of His being Idea, and consequently Law, *in supremis*, as well as Supreme Being.

This teaching about the *signoria* of the Idea in the universe helps to reveal how completely Gioberti was imbued with the modern conception of the Reign of Law. But the weakness of lay in the fact that Gioberti had not faced the weight of criticism of the miraculous as at least it has come to shape itself for us in modern times.

We have of course grown out of the dogmatisms of writers like Strauss and Rénan. But, to the typical modern philosopher, the thought of miracle does not appeal, because he considers that a man must needs possess a sheer omniscience before he can claim to certify that any particular recorded event supposedly miraculous really did not conform to any existing

cosmic law. Miracles, therefore, granted that they really do happen, can never perhaps be certified to us in such a manner as to affect modern philosophic thought.

For us the real interest in Gioberti's thought is that, although he himself accepted Miracle, and adduced miracles as evidence of a theistic view, his central defence of theism and of the personality of God is based on conceptions which are quite apart from any belief in the miraculous strictly so defined. Gioberti that is, taught that there was a Reign of Law of the Supernatural in what we should call the 'emergence' of the Supernatural from the Natural. This teaching conforms with the usual scholastic distinction between 'supernatural acts' such as the Redemption of the World, and 'miraculous events' such as the Feeding of the Four Thousand in the Wilderness. But while, as we shall see, Gioberti's thought-system allows for miracles it is quite independent of their aid. In his idea of Redemption, at least, he is concerned with the Supernatural only in the strict scholastic sense of the word.

Gioberti championed the Supernatural as against Spinoza and Hegel, but at the same time presented it in conformity with the Reign of Law in his second formula, his *formula di rivelazione*. This is *l'Ente redime le esistenze*; in Latin, *Ens redimet existentias*;[5] which means that the Supreme Being who is constituent to all existences, the sum of which is the unfolding Natural Order, is also, in accord with his own essential character, unfailingly and in all the universe 'redemptive' of all these existences. Being is so 'redemptive' wherever that same Idea or Law by which these existences have been brought to life, now also renders such redemption inherently possible. In thus trying to find a real place in the universe for Redemption, Gioberti proved himself one of the most original thinkers. He recognized that for a philosopher to take any such conception as that of Redemption seriously he must consider it as operative, or at least latently operative, in every phase or portion or aspect of the universe. Redemption must also conform, in every respect, with the Reign of Law, or else the philosopher would continue to treat it as a myth.

[5] Literally 'Being redeems existences'; that is, 'The Absolute Being is in the act of continuously redeeming existences.'

Now we have seen that Gioberti did not fully work out the idea of 'emergence' in his theory of an unfolding Creation, because at the time he wrote he had not to face the problem that Spencer and Darwin helped to make prominent. But in his theory of Redemption he fully anticipated the idea of Emergence and applied it in important bearings in relation to the whole of the religious impulse of mankind.

According to this theory, all religions which ever have been or will be are the outcome of the same creative urge of Being to produce existences, an urge in virtue of which the entire evolutionary order of the universe subsists. This evolutionary order proceeds in conformity with the Idea, or Reign of Law, in all things. This same Idea or Reign of Law makes it possible that the 'existent' should itself become the subject of the same creative impulse of Being now turned conservingly within present existences, rather than as using them as mere building material to be appropriated for new 'evolutionary advance.'

In propounding his '*l'Ente redime le esistenze*,' Gioberti was well aware of how writers like Goethe and Schelling taught, in a pantheistic sense, that Nature was not only self-evolving but also self-medicinal and self-healing. And perhaps had Gioberti himself succumbed to the appeal of the Philosophic Idealists, he could never have got out of the pantheistic *impasse* of such teaching. He was able, however, to do so because he was a Realist; because as a Realist he construed the personality of man realistically in a way to make it include contact with the world-process as part of its intrinsic essence; because, also, in following that, in one sense, our personalities are the material realities that Philosophic Materialists declare them to be, he considered them, for this very reason, to be the proper subjects or magnets of the whole redemptive impulse of Being in the universe. He argued then that since Being, in this fashion, 'ripped our personalities,' and did so in conformity with the Reign of Law in the Universe, we have sure grounds for considering that, in a sense acceptable to the ordinary religious person, the Supreme Being or Reality is a personal God.

Whether or not Gioberti made full use of this fruitful thought of his of an intrinsic Redemptive Principle in the universe must be left to the judgment of those who care to read his

Studio. But it will readily be seen that, in chapters of that book, Gioberti sets forth Idea or Law as governing all the religions with absolute impartiality and governing also all Biblical Religion and 'governing' Christ. In fact, to him Christ is Christ because He alone has supremely complied with the Reign of Law; so that He is Himself the Idea, the Redemptive Law of the universe, in person; what Gioberti calls *Idea umanata*.[6]

In his VIIIth Chapter, *Delle convenienze della formula ideale colla religione rivelata*, in which he unfolds this thought, Gioberti wisely keeps away from appeals to Miraculism. To him the redemptive urge intrinsic to Being is operative everywhere, and as, in one sense, the Deed or Act which, in essence, is more fundamental even than the Idea or Word, it follows that Redemption, the reality, must, in the course of time, intrude itself into our human awareness. The Hebrew Prophets surmise this reality of Redemption; their apprehension of Redemption about to be is what is called Revelation. And actual Redemption follows its pre-announcement in human consciousness, because it already reigns in all the universe, and is therefore certain, in time, to feel its way into some phase or other of the world life. It is likely enough to do so, in seeming favouritism for some one People who, just because, more than any other, they have been placed on the brink of continuous peril from the great World Powers, were supremely in position to take in the reality of this omnipotent Redemptive Urge.

Gioberti as a realist and a Catholic conceived of Redemption as a literal actuality, as a cosmos of personalities in attunement with the cosmos of Unfolding Nature. To him, in fact, the spiritual salvation on the lines worked out by the Neo-Puritan world would have been but a Hellenising evasion of Reality. As a matter of fact, the modern supporters of Spiritual Religion who take their intellectual lead from Kant, Schleiermacher and Ritschl, and who appeal to the new interpretations of the material world in the terms of electric mass, owe a great deal of their vogue at the present day to the fact that the Practical Realists on the Traditional side have not advanced any serious criticism of their Spiritual Theory. A Practical Realist who, in the lead of Gioberti, cared to criticize the

[6] That is, 'The Idea, the Absolute Idea, made man,' or 'humanised.'

Spiritual View referred to, might well reply to those who claim hat immortality consists in an 'emergence' out of Matter that o such view has the least measure of support from actual cience. The discovery of the electronic constitution of matter uch rather proves the infinite riches of matter than its alleged overty or evanescence. Theories about the passing beyond natter into a spiritual state are an unsubstantiated dream.

Gioberti has his say here by declaring that what Traditionlists call redemption, salvation and immortality are to be contrued in the terms of a conserval of the relevant elements onstituent to our personal identity; a new cosmos, as he called , identical in substance with the known universe, but differing rom it only in its 'relevance' for subserving the continuance of ur individual self-identity unendingly. Gioberti, in this sense, onceived of Immortality both 'dynamically' and also 'collecively.' Man could only live for ever because there was an ternal redemptive or conserving urge in all the universe; and was possible for him to fulfil the conditions imposed by the eign of Law in order to profit himself by the existence of this edemptive Urge.

To Gioberti, one of the conditions, in this fashion, to the ntering into life, was the acceptance of Redemption as the ivine realization of the latently universal collective personality f man. Granted that there was anything of a real Communion f Saints, apart from the term merely symbolizing 'ethical greement,' then, to Gioberti, one could predicate the true relativity' of bodily death. The Community itself becomes body' to the continuous self-identity of those who have experinced individual bodily death. The Community was the reserve ody that, in the parting hour, was able to discount the onset of real' bodily death.

The Community, in fact, must be postulated, because only Community, or Communion of Saints, is able to store up the nfolding of the Redemptive Urge in its slow passage through ne centuries, outlasting as it does the bodily existence of any olated individual man. So the Community exists primarily in rder, in the collective self-bestowal of all its living members, o discount the natural effects of bodily death of each of its ndividual members.

In this sense Gioberti interpreted Christian Faith and Love 'realistically.' To him they helped to knit together lives in such a way that life and death were 'pooled together' advantageously for all concerned. In the one Communion, the Departed had died relative to their individual bodies; they had not died relative to their Community of Faith and Love. The Community, in its temporal life, lived partly in an 'experience of Death,' the effect of which really was a dissociation of so much of its own 'temporal vitality' as was needed to keep away real death from its members who were to experience individual bodily death. In the course of this synthesis of Life in Love, Redemption unto true Immortality slowly unfolded itself under the terms and conditions of the immutable Reign of Law. The Community, bound in Faith and Love, continued until the passing through of every world-crisis; until the final attainment of the immortality of a redemptive attunement of man with God's Universe; an attunement achieved through the Idea which itself was the Law of Life of the Universe.

So much for Gioberti's philosophic defence of redemption and immortality on the lines of a realism which acknowledged the reality of matter and of the world process. It is only necessary now to enquire how the truth and value of this philosophical conception of Redemption can be translated for the actual seeker after a living religion of redemption.

It will be observed how far apart Gioberti is from the modern neo-puritan, or believer in spiritual immortality. To Gioberti it is possible especially to know of the Supreme Being as a person because the individual human self is a simple nothingness unless it is 'eternally redeemed.' In his system there is not the least need to inject a series of strange metaphysical properties into the *ego*, self, or soul, so as to render such immortal. The self and soul are immortal because Redemption itself is an eternal fact; and even if they do not bring immortality in their hands, after Plato's manner of thinking, they yet find it in the fact that the eternal Redeemer Himself eternally lives.

And we are entitled to call Being in this, its redemptive capacity, personal, because the opening or need for redemption, in an absolute sense, being there, the actual coming of Re-

emption is through our experience of that gripping or con-erving force within our personalities which is rightly called ving and personal in character. Whether or not any manner f philosophic thought can provide a satisfactory definition to ıe philosopher as to what the personality of God means to the eligious man may be hard to decide on. Our 'personality,' onsidered in its stricter sense as our self-hood or self-identity, the mere sum of all those little particularities in which each f us is marked off from other men and from everything else in ıe universe. Now, the religious person feels that there is omething in the Deity which renders Him susceptive to this ım of all our little private particularities which make up our elf-hood. Most philosophers, following Spinoza, believe that ıe supposition that the Supreme Being can concern itself with ll these particularities of each human self is an illusion that we ıake for ourselves in order to symbolize the workings of some eneral law of spiritual uplift operative in the universe.

Here Gioberti's 'Redemption,' added to his Realism, sup-lies a present redeeming efficacy in every phase of our per-onality which closely corresponds with the demands of the eligious person. Perhaps it differs from it, or rather it exceeds , by considering the action of Grace, that is, the act of the elf-imparting of God to Man, quite apart from arbitrariness, nd, from eternity to eternity, conformable with the rule *Ens edimet existentias*, operative for Gioberti in all the universe.

There is no need to discuss in detail Gioberti's application f his doctrine of the *Ens Redimens* to the story of the Religion f Israel, of Christianity and of the other religions. Himself a eading champion of the Italian *Risorgimento*, the Abbate Gio-erti, as one would have expected, interpreted the history of eligion on the lines of a Liberal Realism. He was as liberal ı spirit in his own fashion as were the champions of Spiritual eligion on the lines of Kant and Schleiermacher. But Gioberti as their antithesis in the absolute concreteness with which he onceived that every detail of Redemption comprised a true arallel with the progress of Creation or the Creative Order. n doing so, Gioberti bravely faced problems that our Spirituals ave hitherto left mostly out of count, but problems which in ıe long run we shall each and all have to face.

EVANGELICALS UNDER THE NEW PRAYER BOOK*

God is a spirit, and they that worship Him must worship in spirit and truth.—*John* iv, 24.

ACCEPTANCE of the Revised Prayer Book by the National Assembly of the Church of England is so important an event in the history of the Church that it will surprise no one if I discuss this morning the resulting situation.

The new Book is, of course, not yet legally authorized for use in public worship. It has still to be reviewed by the Ecclesiastical Committee of the two Houses of Parliament, and to be subsequently accepted by those Houses. The Ecclesiastical Committee has to consider the expediency of the measure which gives effect to the revision, and to see that it does not prejudice the constitutional rights of His Majesty's subjects. The Committee will doubtless bestow particular attention on the new powers assigned to the Archbishop and Bishops of either Province whereby they may make rules for the conduct of public worship and for the regulation of the practice of reservation. Such powers are unprecedented, and the range of their application is ill-defined. The regulations, which under such powers may from time to time be issued, will have the force of law; and thus, in my opinion, a sense of uncertainty will be created which will probably increase the present disorder in the Church. The existence of the new powers is seen to be the more significant when the silences of the new Book are pointed out. Will the use of incense be illegal in future? Will reservation in a tabernacle be allowed? The Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, in the Report of 1906, which led to the present revision of the Prayer Book, mentioned among irregularities of especial gravity 'reservation of the sacrament under conditions which lead to its adoration.' This irregularity will be, in effect, legalized if tabernacles are permitted. To preserve the pure worship of God as Spirit is, as history shows, most difficult. In the Roman Church the wafer is adored as the sacred victim. In the Eastern Church, after centuries of conflict, the cult of the sacred ikons, holy pictures, established itself. So strong did it

* A Sermon by the Right Reverend E. W. Barnes, D.D., Sc.D., F.R.S., Bishop of Birmingham, at Westminster Abbey, Sunday, July 17th, 1927.

become that to-day, in those parts of Russia where Communism has replaced Christianity, candles burn before pictures of Lenin which have replaced those of the Virgin and the Saints. I have myself carefully studied the situation which will arise if and when the new Prayer Book becomes lawful, and I believe that it will be practically impossible for any individual bishop to prevent usages whose basis is some erroneous doctrine akin to transubstantiation. The new Book takes the first step, and a long one, towards the change of doctrine in the English Church. Evangelicals have voted for it in the belief that its concessions mark a limit which would not be transgressed. I believe that if we have not actually crossed the Rubicon, the bridge is built over the stream.

There are many Churchmen who share my doubts and see in the changes now proposed the undermining of the spiritual sacramentalism established at the Reformation. Some talk of leaving the Church. I urge that they should do nothing of the kind. We cannot foresee the future. Irrational religious beliefs 'flow like the Solway but ebb like its tide.' A new Evangelicalism, fortified by modern scholarship and science, may speedily arise to strengthen the Church and cleanse it from sacramental error. At the worst Evangelicals can enjoy toleration owing to the explicit statement in the Preface to the new Book that the Bishops have not meant any change of doctrine. It is true that in the next generation the Thirty-nine Articles will probably be revised in a Catholic direction and that the Ecclesiastical Courts may be remodelled so as to take decisions as to doctrine from the purview of lay judges. But, even so, evangelical teaching can be maintained within the Church. The real danger of the future is that, failing a new religious movement within the Church, Evangelicals will gradually drop away as the present decrease in Evangelical clergy continues. We shall then witness on a large scale a repetition of the process by which, rather more than a century ago, the Church was impoverished by losing the Methodists. The Church of England would become an Anglo-Catholic sect. But that *dénoument* is still distant: Evangelicals ought not to hasten it by impulsive separation at the present time.

It will be observed that I do not make the usual plea for comprehensiveness by which acceptance of the new Book is often

supported. I do not myself think that we can combine within the same communion diametrically opposite opinions on fundamental doctrines. The Reformation was a struggle between two different forms of faith: the intensity of their opposition still remains.

To the student of religion the origin of the two conflicting types of Christianity now struggling for mastery is found in the circumstances of its rise and growth. Christianity began within Judaism: it spread among peoples saturated with the beliefs of the pagan mystery religions. Catholicism, as we see it in its full development in the Roman Church, is a Christianized mystery religion. Evangelical Protestantism represents a repudiation of accretions from paganism and a return to the faith taught by Jesus in the Gospels. It arose naturally when the Renaissance caused men to examine the beliefs and practice of the mediaeval Church in the light of the New Testament record. Its weakness to-day is due to a distrust caused by modern Biblical scholarship. But the spiritual value of the teaching of the great Hebrew prophets and especially of Jesus Himself, the culmination of their insight and ideals—such value is unaffected by modern scholarship: and when men fully recognize this truth Evangelicalism will renew its power.

Let me recall the foundations of Evangelical faith. Belief in God, Creator and Lord of all, comes as in purity of heart and service to our fellow-men we seek and find an understanding of the reason of our existence. A sense of trust and love arises insurgent above the waste and cruelty of nature and human society as we see life through the insight of Jesus. We are born again as we know God's presence and are assured of His care. We need no priest to bring us to His presence: our Lord was a layman and all Christian people are His priests. Our worship is that of men free and equal before God; we are joined by Sacraments which express our unity, one with another, in dependence upon God alone. The Spirit of God comes to and embraces the spirit of the man who seeks and serves Him. Man thus enters upon eternal life. He needs no apparatus of salvation as he yields to the constraining love of God.

Contrast with such a faith the Catholic system by which some would have us replace it. That system grew up in a period when

he progressive deterioration of human thought was painfully apid. It represents an amalgam of Christian teaching with beiefs of the Mediterranean populace which proved too strong to e suppressed.

The mystery religions of pagan antiquity varied widely in haracter. Some permitted gross orgies: others encouraged noral purity. Crude superstitions and incredible myths were aught and accepted, and yet were sometimes so allegorized as o have real spiritual value. Common to all these religions, howver, was a mechanism of salvation. Ritual means of initiation nd redemption were provided by which the worshipper might e assured of salvation. The priests of the cult claimed knowedge and powers whereby eternal life might be won: the worhipper of Mithra by his sacraments was reborn for eternity and o freed from the fear of extinction at death: Orphism could ive man release from the weary round of rebirths in a troubled world. In Orphism, centuries before Christ, according to a nodern scholar, 'the supreme means of grace is the sacramental east in which the soul feeds on the substance of the god who uffered, died and rose again, and thereby is assured of ultimate leliverance from the cycle of rebirth.' No one can study these eligious ideas and fail to realize how strongly they became ntrenched in Catholicism. When typical reformers four cenuries ago said that they had read the New Testament from eginning to end and had failed to find in it the Mass, they were epudiating developments of Christianity which had no warrant n the teaching of Jesus. They therefore replaced the Mass by he New Testament rite of the Lord's Supper. They thus rereated the Sacrament of Christian unity, the fellowship meal in which Christ's followers are joined in a unity of service to their Lord. The belief that at consecration a change took place in the substance of the bread and wine was emphatically rejected. It elongs to a lower phase of religious culture than we get in pure Christianity. Yet it has been revived in our Church in recent ears, and to it the new Prayer Book makes dangerous conessions. Rooted in the unconscious mind of sections of the ommunity, this kind of idea has shown renewed vitality in the eligious upset caused by the War. Perchance it is a symptom f religious degeneration which will die away if we can get an

era of peace in which spiritual religion can re-assert its supremacy. We cannot prophesy. The scholar whom I have quoted notes, as a historian, how repeatedly from the depths of the human mind there arise 'primeval images of thought and modes of feeling which the rational mind had learned to despise as the grotesque and incredible play of mythical fancy.' No one who surveys the present religious turmoil of Western civilization will deny that the renewal of unreasonable fancies is everywhere apparent. Meanwhile our duty seems to be clear. We in the Church of England have to maintain and strengthen that faith in God and man's redemption through the Spirit of Christ which our forefathers derived from our sacred records. With our fuller knowledge of the history and nature of the physical universe, we cannot assent to all the beliefs of the Reformers. But the core of their faith remains intact. God rules the universe which He created. He made man for His service, the service of righteousness and truth. Christ, living Spirit no less than historical Jesus, inspires us to undertake this service. Through it we are joined to Him and to God. As we thus seek the highest end of our being, all life is made sacramental; and, moreover, from Baptism and the Eucharist every suggestion of magic falls away. Baptism is the symbol of allegiance to Christ, and the symbol becomes effective when it means membership of a society loyal to the Lord. In the Eucharist we do show forth the Lord's death till He come and gain strength to understand that, through suffering and renunciation no less than through joy and peace, we are brought near to God. But the two sacraments of the Church do not exhaust God's gift of Himself. A follower of the Prophet of Galilee misreads the Gospel story if he can find no sacramental value in sunshine or in the simple joys of daily life. All that is wholesome and beautiful, all that draws men to righteousness and truth, whether it brings pleasure or pain, is a manifestation of that working of God which cleanses the soul. Such is, as I understand it, true Christianity—the religion which Jesus taught and showed forth. And so long as in our Church we are permitted thus to worship Him, there is a place for us: and not only a place but also a duty, the duty of weaning men from blindness and misunderstanding and irrelevant superstition to the simplicity of a purely spiritual faith.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE FUTURE OF CHRISTIANITY.*

Here is another volume of essays! Of the fourteen well known contributors six are Anglicans and eight belong to the various Free Churches. They have in common a general agreement that there is need for a modern restatement of Christian doctrine, and that the starting point of such restatement must be the data of experience. The book as a whole may be regarded as an attempt to give a sketch of an answer to what is one question with a two-fold aspect. The question is whether in the world of modern thought there can be found good reason for believing that in the future Christianity will be accepted as a true revelation and rule of life, and, if so, under what form it will survive.

The Bishop of Gloucester's Introduction calls attention to the fact that scientific theories are constantly being modified, and that philosophical systems change and decay. On the other hand he claims that in the essential and fundamental truths of Christianity there has been no variation. The idea that there is 'on the one side something fixed, certain, indoubted scientific truth; on the other side something vague, changing and therefore doubtful—religion,' is a delusion. In consequence, the idea that 'the test of the truth of Christianity is whether it can be harmonized with the Science or Philosophy of the day must be discarded.' For the person conscious of theological doubt, there is a reflection close at hand which renders Dr. Headlam's contrast between the unvarying truths of Christianity (if by these are meant theological statements of truth) and the constant variations of science and philosophy less impressive than he seems to regard it. The theological statements of the truths of the Christian religion have had the support of a vast society pledged to their acceptance and maintenance. Science and philosophy have neither had nor do they desire any such support for their hypotheses. None the less there is a vast and ever-growing body of scientific knowledge which rests on no other authority than that of its own evident truth and utility.

But Dr. Headlam is fully aware that the contrast he makes, and the deduction he draws from it, are not the whole truth. Current exposition of religious truth is always incomplete and mixed with error. The necessary functions of philosophic and scientific speculation are two-fold, namely, first 'to sever from our exposition of the Christian Revelation all the errors which have arisen from the imperfect science and philosophy of the past,' and secondly, 'to bring out more fully the meaning and the value of the truth that has been given to us.'

In the light of these principles Dr. Sydney Cave discusses the relation of Christianity to other religions; Dr. Wheeler Robinson the validity of Christian experience. The present relations between philosophy and theology are set forth by Dr. R. S. Franks. The position, as he sees it, may be summed up thus:

> 'All our science is partial: we know piecemeal only. Hence a philosophy that seeks to be purely scientific tends to be partial only. Either it gives unity by the suppression of vital elements, or its unity is only the unity of an aggregate. Only an imaginative world-view conceived in the spirit of religion can ever hope to interpret the whole.'

**The Future of Christianity.* Edited by Sir James Marchant, K.B.E., LL.D. (London: John Murray. Price 7/6.)

The doctrines of God, of the Holy Spirit, of the Church and Sacraments are treated respectively by the Archbishop of Armagh, Prof. H. R. Mackintosh and Canon C. E. Raven. Canon Raven would be the last to defend his essay against a charge of inadequacy, but few will feel that the Bishop of Gloucester's personal disagreement with the author's opinions about the place of women in the Christian Ministry (which find expression only in two brief phrases) afford an adequate justification for the tone of the condemnation which the Bishop allows himself to pronounce in his Introduction. Prof. A. S. Peake's contribution on the nature and authority of Scripture is in every way admirable, and should be pondered by any who feel that criticism has destroyed the value of the Bible. Dr. Peake's essay and that of Dr. W. R. Matthews on 'The Doctrine of Christ' are perhaps the most valuable and suggestive in the book. Dr. Matthews believes that 'the advance of thought is making the apprehension of God in Christ easier not harder.' He expresses his dissatisfaction with the Conciliar Christology in quite definite terms. Contemporary philosophy, he writes,

> 'was singularly unfitted for the purpose of giving intellectual form to Christian faith. The Gospel of God in Christ is the message of supreme revelation through a Person; but the thought of the Greek world was defective in its view of personality, and did not even possess a recognised term for the concept.'

It is the last phase of the classical Christological controversy which reveals the failure to achieve an intellectually coherent doctrine. The question whether in the Incarnate Logos there are two wills or one was more than a revelation of the excessive subtlety of the Greek mind:

> 'Given that there are two natures, utterly distinct and disparate, united without fusion in Christ, we cannot help asking whether "nature" includes will.'

Dr. Matthews shows that either possible answer is equally intolerable. Of the controversies as a whole he says:

> 'The root difficulty was the dualistic conception of the divine and human natures. What is utterly separate cannot be brought together.'

Dr. Matthews sketches the outline of a constructive modern Christology. It is only a value-judgement about the life and teaching of Christ as affording a supreme guide to life which can supply the motive for considering the nature of His Person. We are compelled to relate Him to our conception of Reality. From the standpoint of Theism, evolution involves both a self-limitation of God and a self-expression and fulfilment. The most adequate expression is in human personality, and no person is wholly explicable on evolutionary lines. Dr. Matthews sees evidence in modern philosophy, and particularly in Gentile, of something which comes to our assistance at this point. 'We are led to think of that which constitutes the personality as 'act' rather than 'substance'; but 'this act which constitutes me is not different from the creative activity which moves in evolution,' and so 'there is a sense in which all persons have a divine Ground and the Logos is truly the light of every man.' In us, the actual ego is not unified by a dominating central purpose: it is 'spoiled by error slothfully accepted and by evil not overcome.' In the Person of Jesus it is not so. In Him we find unbroken unity through plurality 'the triumphant creation of spiritual value by the overcoming of every form of negation. The empirical historical personality of Jesus is the adequate Incarnation in time and space of the Eternal Word.'

Further chapters in this volume include Racial and Individual Sin (by Dr. F. R. Tennant), Forgiveness and Atonement (by Dr. Garvie), Eternal Life (by Canon Storr), The Gospel and Modern Life and in Human Society (by the President of New York Theological Seminary and by Principal Lofthouse), and The Evangelization of the World (by Dr. Garfield Williams).

It will be clear that, despite its title, *The Future of Christianity* is not an apocalyptic prophecy. Sir James Marchant is justified in his view of it as 'a common body of wise and sober teaching, which will prepare the way for further united work on the restatement of Christian Truths in the light of modern knowledge,' and in promoting and editing the book he has performed a useful service in the cause of reunion and restatement. What is needed is more effective co-operation in the practical work of the general preaching of Christianity on the part of those who approach its theological problems in the spirit and along the lines of the authors of these essays. Sir James Marchant is working for these ideals, and we wish him good success.

J.S.B.

ENGLISH MODERNISM.*

The Noble lectures at Harvard were founded in 1898 'to extend the influence of Jesus as the way, the truth and the life.' In previous years they had been delivered by some distinguished Englishmen, including Bishop Headlam. The choice last year of Dr. Major was the more appropriate because he is a New Zealander, and in some ways the people of the British dominions are more sympathetic to Americans than is the regular John Bull. One quality which New Zealanders showed in the Great War was adventurous courage; and this is perhaps the most striking trait in Dr. Major's writing. He does not hedge. He quotes with approval the French saying 'If one carries one's flag in one's pocket, it ceases to be a flag and becomes a pocket-handkerchief.' No one can accuse him of pocketing his flag. He states at the beginning that he appears not as a judge but as an advocate; and he proceeds to set forth the claims of Modernism in all their aspects. Thus he aims rather at a comprehensive account than either at novelty or at philosophic depth. Nevertheless the book is full of striking sayings, partly the writer's own, partly taken from other writers, in which selection he shows exceptional skill: a multitude of writers are cited, especially such as are characteristically *alive and kicking*, whether ancient or modern. He attributes the failure of the Continental Modernists of twenty years ago mainly to their love of anonymity and their fear of authority: though this does not apply to Loisy and Tyrrell.

Yet Dr. Major can scarcely be called an extremist. He fully realises that the great advantage of the English Church is its central position, and agrees with Guizot that, if Christendom is ever to be reunited, it will be through the agency of the English Church. Modernism is, in fact, an epitome of the English Church. It has two wings—the Liberal Protestant, which is in touch with the ethical idealism of the last century, and with the Nonconformists; and the Modernist Catholic, which feels more strongly an affinity with the great churches of East and West. Dr. Major thinks that the second of these wings has more vitality, and he is probably right. If the Modernist movement succeeds in bringing together these two tendencies, it will have made a good start towards universality and, if I

**English Modernism: its origin, method, aims.* By H. D. A. Major, D.D., Principal of Ripon Hall, Oxford. (University Press. 1927.). (The Noble Lectures at Harvard, 1925–6.). Price 10/6 net.

am rightly informed, a precedent is offered by the Scandinavian Churches, which combine conservatism in order and ritual with great breadth of theological view.

Dr. Major's book is not only the stirring appeal of one who has proved himself a leader, but also a comprehensive sketch of The Rise of Modernism. He adds three important appendices: the first containing the answers of prominent Modernists as to the need and use of a Creed: the second giving the results so far reached by the Archbishops' doctrinal commission: the third giving a list of Modernist works published in English, showing how rapidly the volume of such works has increased. The index also is admirably full.

It is quite unnecessary here to summarize the views of Dr. Major. They are well known to readers of the *Modern Churchman*. But it is of great advantage, in view of the coming Conference at Selly Oak, to have them set out in brief and orderly form. They make an excellent starting point; and with Canon Streeter's book on *Reality*, and (I may venture to add) my own little book on Modernism, serve as an up-to-date sketch of the modernist movement. The fact that of Dr. Streeter's thorough-going and expensive book some 7,000 copies have been sold is sufficient proof that the subject is of interest to many intelligent readers in England. The tide is flowing; and it is for Modern Churchmen to take it at the flood.

P. GARDNER.

THEODORE OF MOPSUESTIA AND MODERN THOUGHT.*

Both in influence and in reputation the theology of Antioch has been overshadowed by that of Alexandria. 'The violent bear it away.' From the first the Alexandians succeeded in attaching a suspicion of heresy to the Syrians; and, as they secured the support of Rome, this suspicion passed into the Western Church. It was inherited by the Reformed Churches, which took over too much of the *damnosa hereditas* of the schoolmen without criticism: nor was it till our own day that its justification was questioned. Duchesne's *Histoire Ancienne de l'Eglise,* and (in England) Canon Raven's *Apollinarianism,* are evidence of a reaction to which a paper on *The Human Approach to the Incarnation,* in the *Modern Churchman* of July, 1924, called attention; and in Dr. Patterson's suggestive monograph on Theodore of Mopsuestia we have a notable appreciation of a school the neglect of which has been a source of weakness to modern theology. To Christology, in particular, Antioch supplied a balance which has been lost, and, if progress is to be made, must be restored.

Antioch had, indeed, no Origen. But neither had it a Cyril. It interpreted the Scripture like any other book. And, as a great Oxford teacher reminds us, 'It is no exaggeration to say that he who, in the present state of knowledge, will confine himself to the plain meaning of words and the study of their context may know more of the original spirit and intention of the authors of the New Testament than all the controversial writers of former ages put together.' Few, if any, theologians have successfully avoided misconception; St. Gregory Nazianzen has been called 'The Father of the Fathers,' because he is said to have done so; but such instances are rare.

'But (says Dr. Patterson) if a theologian is to be blamed for the false interpretation which others put upon his doctrine, then very few scholars

**Theodore of Mopsuestia and Modern Thought.* By L. Patterson, D.D. (S.P.C.K. 1926. Price 6/- net.)

f ancient or modern times would escape condemnation. The most favourble estimate of Theodore's theology is given in a recent work entitled *hristianity in History* (Bartlet & Carlyle). It is stated there that "Theoore of Mopsuestia, one of the most modern minds in the Ancient Church n psychological insight, as well as in historical methods of exegesis, came earest to a true solution." We agree, in the main, with this estimate; nd shall endeavour to prove that Theodore's doctrine is most easily reconilable with modern science and psychology. We do not claim that either f those departments of knowledge is infallible. But they are bound to xercise some influence on the theology of the future.'

A. Fawkes.

THE ORIGIN OF KINGSHIP.*

If the new historical and psychological study of anthropology succeeds n its attempt to evolve order out of chaos, it will have done a great ervice to science and truth, for it can hardly be denied that, as far as the istory of the evolution of ideas is concerned, the subject has been involved n a vast amount of obscurity. Much material has been collected, but its alue has been impaired often by the curious uses to which it has been put r by an obvious failure to interpret it correctly. The interpretation has een all the more difficult because it has started with many preconceived otions, so that on some sort of homeopathic principle one set of superstiions has been employed to treat or to explain another set. The statements nade by savages themselves as to their original home, and as to the origin f their beliefs, ceremonies and institutions, have been swept aside as uite idle fancies by those who have heard them and have claimed to know etter. Along this line it is obvious that no appreciable progress has been ossible.

The adherents of the new position insist that the whole subject must e treated seriously and scientifically. If the people who in the past have een described with little discrimination as primitive evolved for themelves the ideas with which they have been credited, they must have been s gifted as they were weird; they must have been folk who were endowed ith a power of imagination unexcelled even by that of modern novelists. n short, they must have been such folk as never yet existed on land or ea. As a matter of fact, it is urged, really primitive folk have very few leas and very little imagination; and the savages who are supposed to ave developed a mysterious culture of their own simply furnish us with xamples, when their institutions are analysed, of the degradation of a igher culture.

The new position is certainly revolutionary; but since we live in days n which people are trying earnestly to see things from new angles, it is ifficult to understand why it should have met with such fierce opposition. pparently it gives offence because it conflicts with a long cherished ogma. It is to be rejected without any serious attempt being made to xamine or to test its validity. Its exponents are to be waived aside as ersons who do not know what they are talking about and simply do not ount. They are to be described as no anthropologists, whatever else they ay be. This, in another field, is the attitude of the old heresy-hunters ver again. It is an attitude which makes Mr. A. M. Hocart's book on *ingship* a work of special interest and significance, for no one can uestion the thoroughness of his training as an anthropologist. Starting

**Kingship*. By A. M. Hocart. (Oxford University Press. 1927. Pp. vii, 250. 12/6 et.)

as a classical scholar, he has done anthropological field-work for many years, and has studied the native languages as well as the institutions. His methods are historical and psychological; but he has worked upon more or less independent lines, and has not identified himself closely with those who are supposed to take up an extreme position. And yet his results tend to support in very large measure the conclusions of those who have come to be regarded as notorious representatives of the new position!

Mr. Hocart's book is concerned primarily with the rites of the Coronation Ceremony. He discovers that 'as we analyse monarchial institutions from Europe to the Pacific we shall gradually find ourselves tracing all the manifold variety to the same original: the institution of Divine Kings.' The king, through the ritual, became a god with the attributes of the sun, which suggested, *inter alia*, not only the idea of healing, but even the idea of law and order, right and righteousness. He might have quoted the Old Testament passage about the sun of righteousness arising with healing in his wings. Anyhow, 'the sun, whether from the beginning or in the course of later speculations, took the lead in the glorification of gods and kings.' Closely related to ceremonies of Coronation are ceremonies of Ordination and Initiation. If we place at the beginning a ceremony of Installation, this will have been the common parent on the one side of Coronation and Ordination, and on the other of Initiation. The ordinary marriage ceremony is related to the Coronation Ceremony. Indeed it is 'nothing but the matrimonial part of the coronation ceremony detached and simplified for the use of the common people.' Even Creation stories are really Creation ceremonies. In other words, they are Re-creation ceremonies. Mr. Hocart might have added that in all probability the same thing is true of Flood stories and of other stories of the Destruction of Mankind.

Enough has been said to indicate that Mr. Hocart's book is extraordinarily interesting as a contribution to the study of anthropology. It may be added that there is much in it which should arrest the attention of Biblical students and theologians. The author has occasion sometimes to refer to the Old and the New Testament, and often to quote some of our well-known hymns. He could hardly have avoided touching upon Christianity. When he does so, he writes with friendly sympathy and appreciation. It is, of course, quite a common occurrence to hear people criticising some of our hymns and making fun of them. Mr. Hocart suggests that when these are understood historically, they are not really as funny as people think them. Take the lines

> 'Truth the ancient type fulfilling,
> Isaac bound, a victim willing,
> Manna to the fathers given.
>
> Very Bread, Good Shepherd, tend us,
> Jesu, of Thy Love befriend us.'

At first sight the succession of metaphors may seem bizarre and bewildering. But those who know exactly what the writer is talking about 'know that his lines are an extreme condensation of Biblical legend, Christian ritual and dogma, all of which the audience is supposed to be familiar with.'

Mr. Hocart has given us a very noteworthy book. It is so original and stimulating that its wealth will not be exhausted at one reading. It should be read, and read again.

MAURICE A. CANNEY.

Manchester University.

SIR OLIVER LODGE AND THE FUTURE.*

In the first series of Halley Stewart Lectures, delivered by Sir Oliver Lodge in 1926, the veteran scientist formally expresses the substance of much which he has previously said on various occasions. These lectures contain his mature reflections on the contributions made by science to human progress in the past, and adumbrate far-reaching contributions in the near future. Sir Oliver's outlook embraces the whole Universe, and it breathes the calm triumphant spirit of Shakespeare's *Tempest*. He writes: 'For myself I do not feel oppressed by any conflict between Religion and Science, when both are reasonably understood. Both involve knowledge of certain aspects of one and the same Universe; and controversies arising between them must be of the nature of misunderstandings and mistakes, mainly due to our looking at one aspect from the point of view of the other.'

Sir Oliver is impressed by the 'utter absence of infallibility in human beings, whether it be about the subject-matter of science or anything else. In his lectures he takes a 'broad survey; bearing in mind that every perceived fact, every reasonable speculation, and every advance in knowledge must have a bearing one way or another on the cultivation of the human spirit and the progress and destiny of man.' He himself, through long study of facts, has 'come to the conviction that man has a destiny far beyond this mortal life; that he and his like are beings of high value in the Universe; that they will be able to strive and serve and influence long after they have shuffled off the mortal coil; that, indeed, we are beings for whom any amount of trouble has been taken, and is being taken, by Higher Powers; and that it is to this end that all the labour of planetary preparation has gone on.' And he expresses his confidence 'that these things have an ultimate purpose; we cannot grasp that purpose in its fullness; but we can have faith that if and when we do grasp it, we shall realise that all the pain and struggle were worth while.'

On Revelation and Vision, Sir Oliver says: 'Meanwhile a mere conviction of survival is now no act of faith; it is the outcome of knowledge; it is established by scientific enquiry. If all the incidents of spirit communication could be collected, if even all the incidents known to me were put together, the only refuge from conviction would be a case-hardened attitude of determined opposition and irrational prejudice. The evidence goes on accumulating; we have not to appeal to something in the past which has now ceased; here and now, and continually, the evidence is forthcoming. It is possible to shut our minds to it, to refuse to listen to it, or attend; but the rejection of fact is not a truly scientific attitude. The existence of a spiritual world in or around us is demonstrated. It lies outside our normal ken; but then such a heap of realities do that. Essentially, reality can only be inferred, inferred on a basis of fact and good evidence. There is no need to call in the higher evidence of faith and imagination; the survival of man is becoming an item of scientific knowledge.'

Sir Oliver goes on to predict that: 'There will come a time when every human being will know, perhaps not by his own inquiry, but by universal tradition (just as he knows that the earth is spherical and moving annually round the sun), that the life we see here is only a fraction of the totality of things; that real life is permanent; that existence is never-ending; that evolution and progress continue uninterrupted by the adventure of death; that only the conditions, and not our personalities, are changed. In my view,

**Science and Human Progress*, being the Halley Stewart Lectures, by Sir Oliver Lodge. (George Allen and Unwin. 1927. Price 4/6 net.)

even the conditions are not changed so suddenly and completely as we might without information imagine. Continually we are surrounded by a host of helpers and well-wishers, who are struggling for good, who lament backslidings and weaknesses, who from time to time may be frustrated, but who nevertheless persist in their endeavour. They themselves are guided by higher beings, who see and know far more than we do. The whole of existence is suffused with Divine Purpose and Aim, with which in the long run we must get into accord if we are to achieve happiness; we and they are servants of One in Whose service alone is perfect freedom.'

'All this will in time be known to all. Surely such knowledge must have an influence. In one form or another it has been the message of Religion, the fundamental part of the message, and surely religion has been a power for good in the world! So it may turn out that Science, though only trying to ascertain and make sure of fact, yet by the mere power of truth will have an influence for good likewise. Truth is always a step up. Some truths are many flights up, and we may proceed in the hope that we shall arrive at them in due time.' K.M.E.

NOTABLE ESSAYS.*

We are glad that Messrs. Longmans have issued a new impression of Dean Inge's two well known volumes of Outspoken Essays, which are thus made available at about half the original published price. The First Series contains, among others, essays on Patriotism, The Birth-Rate, The Future of the English Race, Cardinal Newman, Institutionalism and Mysticism, and St. Paul. The last named is a masterpiece of vivid presentation in the short space of twenty-five pages. The most remarkable essay in the Second Series is the author's confession of personal religious faith. The Dean's Hibbert Lectures on *The State, Visible and Invisible* also appear in this volume; they are, in his own words, 'a summary of the attempts that have been made in various ages to place human institutions under the sanction of absolute authority.' The Romanes Lecture on *The Idea of Progress* and the Rede Lecture on *The Victorian Age*, with essays on Civilisation and Eugenics complete the collection. All Dr. Inge's characteristic principles and ideas, likes and dislikes, find expression in these volumes, and there must be many who will welcome the opportunity of possessing them at the cost of seven shillings.

J.S.B.

REASONABLE FAITH.†

There can be no doubt that the most fundamental and obstinately irreconcilable religious differences (if we except those which originate and continue in mere prejudice) are due, in the last resort, to inadequate or conflicting estimations of the nature and relative values, and therefore of the respective functions, of faith and reason. The problems are well advanced in age of which, however, like sins, they do not die. In the first and longest of the seven papers which make up the present volume, Professor Galloway attempts to elucidate them from the point of view of one who believes that 'the old method of solving religious difficulties by an appeal to an external authority falls now on unsympathetic ears, and is

**Outspoken Essays.* By W. R. Inge, C.V.O., O.D., F.B.A., Dean of St. Paul's. (Longmans, Green and Co Ltd. First Series, price 3/6; Second Series, price 3/6.)

†*Faith and Reason in Religion.* By George Galloway, D.Phil., D.D., Principal and Primarius Professor of Divinity, St. Mary's College, University of St. Andrews. (London: Nisbet and Co. 1927. Price 7/6.)

omed to prove unfruitful.' He gives a historical sketch of some past ews about the contrasts and relations of faith and knowledge. Next, he aces the emergence of the faith-attitude from lowly beginnings, and then amines its relation with knowledge as evolved in civilized society. Briefly, e position maintained is that scientific knowledge, though real, is never mplete; the syntheses effected by the scientific reason can never be more an partial, and 'there is no organized body of knowledge at our disposal which faith can be either superseded or discredited.' Faith and eason represent two distinctive ways of reacting to experience. 'Reason aves its task unfinished, and man has to win through faith the world-ew, the synthesis, which his spiritual needs demand.' In fact, Dr. alloway might well endorse the words of Dr. Jacks and regard Faith as eason grown courageous.' For, although he maintains that the object faith is ultimate and transcendent, and that, being such, its validity nnot be contested by science, he is equally clear that the particular doc-inal formulations to which faith inevitably proceeds can claim no such mmunity. 'No one has any right to invite faith in a doctrine which can shown to be inconsistent with the results of rational inquiry,' and eligion is ill-served by those who on grounds of authority demand faith anything which contradicts knowledge.' Faith cannot be coerced and iritual conviction cannot be created by a parade of arguments and religi-s evidences. The characteristic of faith lies in the fact that in it the ement of logical compulsion is and must be lacking.

This conclusion that faith and reason are complementary, and that ither should be sacrificed to the other, appears again and again in Dr. alloway's treatment of the questions concerning the origin and truth of ligious beliefs, of history and its religious interpretation, and particu-rly, perhaps, in the useful paper on Grace and Freedom. On the one nd the author breaks with the Augustinian and Lutheran tradition, and the other, he will have nothing to do with modern speculative attempts fuse Grace and Freedom into a fundamental unity. Like reason and ith, for him they stand in a complementary relation. Man is in an en-ronment of sin and in an environment of grace. He can and does choose; en his existing character does not destroy his freedom of choice. Like rgson, Dr. Galloway would urge that the intellectual dilemma of Free-ill and Determinism largely arises from confusing the standpoint of ex-rience with that of reflection on experience. In reflection we are obliged rationalize, and so are bound to try to find continuity between the data experience, but 'the demand for continuity is no pledge that discontinui-s are unreal.' It is as spiritual life grows and 'as character becomes ore and more organized towards the expression of spiritual good' that he possibility of the will to evil grows less and less real. Hence the free-m of open choice gradually loses meaning and the formed will to good nds to become one with the will of God expressed in grace.'

Dr. Galloway also prints an essay on the most difficult of modern eological problems—how to reconcile the concept of evolution with the aim that the Christian religion is final. The comparative study of reli-ons and the history of religions show that every living religion is modi-d and grows through interaction with its cultural environment. The sult of such study is that finality is an illusion. Yet if every element in hristianity is relative the door is opened wide to scepticism and agnosti-sm. Professor Galloway recognizes that if religion comes to be regarded offering only relative goods, we shall come to doubt if they are even latively good. In Roman Catholicism Dr. Galloway sees an attempt to

combine finality with development. It looks impressive, but it fails on two counts. First, the necessary supposition that in the development of doctrine the Church has been so divinely guided as to escape error can only be maintained by ignoring the 'varied psychological and historical motives and influences which entered into the process of growth'; secondly, the idea of development as being merely addition by explication is demonstrably false. More thorough-going was the Catholic Modernist theory of development; but by testing doctrines not by their conformity to a deposit of faith or tradition, but by their working value, Catholic Modernism tended to endorse the Pragmatic principle and to sacrifice the notion of absolute truth. Its trend is towards relativism, not finality, and Loisy affords the example of its natural descent into scepticism. The Hegelian theory that the absolute element in Christianity is the speculative principle of the union of God and man in reality asserts the finality of a philosophical system rather than that of a historic religion. Its weakness is that the speculative principle will inevitably be modified with the development of philosophic thought, and that, historically, the power of Christianity has been in a person rather than in a general principle.

From the Hegelian point of view, Ritschl, Harnack and Bousset represent a reaction in which the final core of the Gospel is the doctrine of the Divine Fatherhood and human brotherhood. It fails historically on the ground that it involves the rejection of much of the teaching of Jesus on other than historical grounds, and it assumes that what is final is the teaching of Jesus rather than Jesus Himself. Troeltsch came to the conclusion that by studying Christianity in its historical setting among other religions it was possible to show its supremacy over them, and that there is really no ground for supposing that it will be superseded. Thus, he held, it was possible to escape the old anti-rational supernaturalism, and also to avoid the acceptance of a rationalistic version of Christianity opposed to its original meaning. Professor Galloway is not convinced that Troeltsch succeeds in reconciling his antagonism to supernaturalism which leads to a view of Christianity as supreme among religions from which it does not differ in kind, and his feeling that there is something quite specific in Christianity which is of importance when its claim to finality is considered. For himself, Dr. Galloway regards the claim to finality as involving commitment 'to a faith in the supernatural of some kind,' though not to a view which implies a total difference in kind between one religion and all the others. 'I cannot see that, if you regard Christ as a revelation from the transcendent sphere, as Troeltsch appears to do, it is consistent to construe the supernatural as a mere survival of an outworn mode of thought.'

Dr. Galloway's own contribution is described as 'some further remarks on the question at issue.' Doctrines are not immutable. The assertion that they are is impossible in view of the manner and conditions under which history shows them to have been formulated. Moreover the apparent fixity is illusory. Dogmas do not mean the same things to different ages, or to different individuals in the same age. The ultimate problem takes the form of the question 'Is there anything absolute and ultimate in the Christian experience?' Dr. Galloway believes that behind the changing doctrinal estimates of the significance of Christ there is Christ Himself; values imply the existence of something to evaluate; they are not free creations of the subject. In the last resort the comparative religio-historic method proves inadequate. Great personalities, and most of all the personality of Christ, cannot be explained on these lines, and we are compelled

to admit the entrance of new creative forces into the historic life, forces which no doubt have a relation to the environment in which they appear but are more than the outcome of that environment.' This merely extends truth of biology and of psychology into the field of history, wherein, indeed, it is more apparent. Doubtless such a view postulates the entrance f the transcendent within the historic, but this is demanded by the fact of hrist, and is bound up with spiritual religion. Thus are we delivered from ie dominion of the relative.

Enough has been said to show that these papers form a very suggestive ook. They are clearly and lucidly written. Dr. Galloway does not succeed in hiding his learning and width of reading, but he does succeed in aking them unobtrusive in a way which enables him to be brief without ppearing to be dogmatic. Perhaps he too seldom comes down to what we ay call the brass tacks of the questions on which he writes for his book o be very helpful to the ordinary reader; it is rather a book for students, iggesting fundamental principles to be borne in mind in the formulation Christian teaching for the modern world.

J.S.B.

CORRESPONDENCE

A HERESY CHARGE IN THE IRISH CHURCH.

To the Editor of the *Modern Churchman.*

R,

I read with natural interest your criticisms of a charge of heresy ought against me by accusers of neither theological nor ecclesiastical anding. By the constitution of our Church, the Primate, Dr. D'Arcy, is liged to appoint a commission of inquiry, who report to him and to two our Civic Judges sitting with him. This has been done and their judgent publicly announced in the Press that a *prima facie* case has not been tablished and that the petition be dismissed and all further proceedings ayed. Personally these charges never worried me. Admittedly I belong the Liberal School of theology, though it is only growing and not come man's estate over here. But this is the twentieth, not the sixteenth, century, and I have great hopes for our liberty of thought and utterance which s heresy case has emphasised. Since this letter is something of an ologia, may I add that I was Scholar and Double First as well as nnelan Lecturer and University Preacher at Trinity College, Dublin. me of the charges were actually founded upon sermons preached by me er twenty years ago in Trinity College Chapel, before the present Prost, Dr. Bernard, and the celebrated Professor Salmon. If such leaders the Church detected no heresy, surely their judgment is of greater worth in that of my accusers. Letters have poured in upon me from all sides many from readers of the *Modern Churchman*—thanking me for 'fears and definite' teaching in my books, *To Christ through Criticism, What our Dead? The Meaning of Things,* and urging me to stand to my ns, which (D.V.) I hope to do. Our parishioners have nobly stood by and have borne all legal expenses involved.

RICHARD W. SEAVERS, B.D.
(*Canon Commissary*).

The Rectory, Malone, Belfast.
12th July, 1927.

PROFESSOR C. C. J. WEBB AND CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

SIR,

Professor C. C. J. Webb's impressions of Christian Science as set forth in his thoughtful article on this subject appearing in your July number call for a word of correction. Referring to the wisdom of Jesus the Professor quotes Mrs. Eddy as saying, 'had wisdom characterized all the sayings of Jesus, he would not have prophesied his own death, and thereby hastened or caused it.'

What Mrs. Eddy really did say was as follows: 'This wisdom, which characterized his sayings, did not prophesy his death and thereby hasten or permit it.' (*Miscellaneous Writings*, p. 84). Christian Scientists have a profound love and reverence for the words and works of the Master, and nowhere in Mrs. Eddy's writings can be found a word or phrase indicating a lack of wisdom or good judgement on the part of the Way-shower, Christ Jesus. I wish I could be permitted to deal with other points raised by Professor Webb's article, but, knowing the limits of your correspondence columns, I have selected a correction which I think the Professor himself would make if he knew that through an incorrect quotation he had misrepresented the teaching of Christian Science in its reverence to the Master.

18 Albion Street,
Hyde Park, W. 2.

ROBERT E. KEY.

'PRESERVE THY BODY.'

SIR,

I was a little sorry that in your article on the Composite Book in the March number you did not allude to a slight change which would have been very welcome, I am sure, to many of us. I mean the words in the administration of the Holy Communion: 'Preserve thy *body* and soul unto everlasting life.' As you rightly say, our theologians have abandoned the doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body, yet we are still to say at one of the most solemn moments of our regular ministry words which must in some sense imply a belief in the preservation of the body of the communicant kneeling before us at the altar rails. A simple change to 'Preserve thee' is all that is needed. Living away from the centre of things, I do not even know whether any such change was ever debated, and I am afraid that it is now too late for it to be made; but I cannot help thinking that I am not the only clergyman who feels unhappy at so often having to say words the meaning of which is to him very questionable, to say the least. I should be very glad to know how others meet, what is to me, a very real difficulty.

Cape Town, S. Africa.

R. PARK.

[By making use of alternative forms permitted by the Deposited Book, we understand that it will be possible to avoid using the phrase of which our correspondent rightly complains.—ED., *M.C.*]

A PRAYER FOR THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION.

The need for a special prayer to be used at our meetings has been felt by many. We have much pleasure in publishing the following composition, and shall be glad to receive others suitable for the purpose.

'O almighty and merciful God, who art the source of light and life to all Thy children, sanctify, we pray Thee, the members of this Union, to the study of Thy truth and the service of Thy kingdom, so that knowledge may be increased, and that charity may abound, among us and throughout the Church: and this we beg, O Heavenly Father, in the name of Thy Son, our Lord, Jesu Christ, to whom with Thee and the Holy Ghost be glory and worship, world without end. Amen.